

# WHITHER, WORLD?

No. CDXLII (442)

*January 2, 2016*

The New Year's Church and world in disarray  
Do make us ask, what can we do? Watch, pray.

So we have reached a new year without either the Church having completely collapsed, or the world having crashed into its Third World War, but both disasters have been brought significantly closer. What path are we on? What chance do we have of avoiding disaster?

As for the world, Syria in particular is being turned into a powder-keg where the powder is being piled up for a bigger and bigger explosion. America and Russia, each with their allies, are ready to fight for either of two contending visions of the world's future: the banksters presently controlling the USA want a unipolar world where their New World Order will exercise a worldwide hegemony; the Russians on the contrary want a multipolar world where they can retain their national independence and look after their own interests. And who can blame the Russians if they want to prevent the NWO from taking over the world? So far they have acted with great restraint in the face of vile provocation from the West.

But as ever, man proposes while God disposes. If men will not stop sinning, then at the moment chosen not by them but by him the dogs of war will be let loose. As usual, men will know why they started the war, but God alone knows how it will end. The Russians have some remarkable weapons, so that the West is by no means sure of "winning," especially if enough prayers go up from all of us to Heaven for the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, because then the Russians might obtain for all of us an interruption of the world's march to the abyss. In any case the war will be just as long and as devastating as God needs for his purpose of saving not civilisations (so called) but souls. Will souls learn their lesson? If not, God may need to allow them to wreak even more havoc upon themselves.

As for the Church, its influence on world events is decisive. Wherever true Catholic priests are administering true Sacraments, they are extinguishing those sins which are the cause of war (James, IV, 1). But what have we seen through 2015? The churchmen presently controlling the Church have shown little to no sign of wanting

to return to the true doctrine of the New Testament from the false principles of Vatican II, and Pope Francis in particular by his unrestrained application of those principles seems intent upon nothing so much as upon destroying the Catholic Church. Now back in the 1970's when the Council's work of devastation seemed irresistible, God in his mercy gave to his Church an Archbishop who would raise a new generation of Catholic priests to witness to the true Faith and show in real life that it was not out of date, thereby acting as a brake upon the devastation. But Archbishop Lefebvre died in 1991, and his successors at the top of his Society soon began losing his grip on the necessity of resisting the modern world with its sinister Council. Through 2015 we saw only one sign after another of the Society drawing closer and closer to neo-modernist Rome.

We are driven to ask, do these successors still have any understanding of why the Archbishop set up his Society of St Pius X in the first place? Do they still have a sense of the true Faith? Do they realize their grave responsibility to witness to that Faith, and not let it be blurred into the world? Let them think hard in 2016, before it is too late, before the Society finally dooms itself to lose all its savour by joining in the Conciliar apostasy, by no longer acting as a thorn in the side of the neo-modernists and by ceasing to sustain that true Church which alone has the secret of world peace, Our Lord Jesus Christ, "yesterday, today and for ever, neither liberal nor modernist" (quotation of Archbishop Lefebvre).

Kyrie eleison.

# FACTORY LIFE

No. CDXLIII (443)

January 9, 2016

Today's work-places crucify a man?  
With a finger-rosary pray wherever you can.

Here is another good letter from a reader of these "Comments." He takes a sane view of an insane scene. Readers may be discouraged by what he describes, or they may be encouraged by how he describes it. A number of readers must recognize what they are up against every day when they go to work, and this letter may help them to see why and how their place of work is eroding their Catholic faith. He writes:—

*I have worked in a factory building cars for over two years now and while it does pay well the environment is a sort of microcosm of the world at large. Let me explain . . .*

*1) **Mixing up of the sexes** – men and women work together in close proximity. Such work completely destroys a woman's femininity. Of course, there are certain jobs which women cannot do, but because of this false sense of equality, the company needs to allow women to work there. The stories that I have heard about the transgressions against the 6th and 9th commandments are truly disturbing. I need not elaborate. But what else did anybody expect? Why would a woman even want to work in such a place?*

*2) **Men's minds are incapable of making moral judgments** – I generalize of course, but most of the men I have talked to do not think in terms of morality (i.e. good and evil) but in terms of what pleasures can keep them entertained. I have talked to several co-workers and have tried to bring up questions of morality in a way that they might understand, but it seems to go over their heads. When a man has steeped himself in the things of the flesh, he is incapable of thinking of the soul. Worse, some of these co-workers have absolutely no shame in boasting of their sins. Once upon a time men had shame. No longer, it would seem.*

*3) **I am my own god** – False liberty is exalted as the guiding principle in men's lives. I have had a few discussions with some of my co-workers and what I get every single time is that truth and morality are purely a subjective affair. What you believe to be truth is fine for you, but you cannot impose your way of thinking on anyone else. I told a supervisor of mine that such thinking is nonsense. I said, what if someone thinks that having more than one wife is*

*fine? He said, belief is up to the individual. If a man denies such a basic principle as that truth is not subjective, then there is no point in talking to him. In essence, every individual becomes his own god because HE has constructed his own reality instead of submitting to something outside of him.*

*The environment of a modern factory breeds a sort of godlessness. I don't expect factory workers to be examples of stellar virtue but I would say that modern factories are exponentially worse than what Charles Dickens wrote about in his times. I can go on and on, but the point I am trying to make is this: how can grace operate in lives which are destroyed through sin and a life of seeking pleasure? How does one reach out to men who cannot even grasp the most elementary norms of morality? It is frustrating to say the least. Please pray for us in the trenches.*

Woman freeing herself from femininity and family, man freeing himself from objective morality and objective truth – how indeed can one reach out to, or even talk with, such a “faithless and perverse generation” (Lk. IX, 41)? By example, charity and prayer. I advised the writer to take a finger rosary to work to be able to pray discreetly decade after decade to pray for his fellow-workers and to protect himself spiritually from his work environment. But he will need to be discreet.

Kyrie eleison.

# CHAOS INCOMPREHENSIBLE?

No. CDXLIV (444)

January 16, 2016

If I cut loose all moorings of my mind,  
How can I be surprised, chaos to find?

A thinking reader of these “Comments” from the United States made several months ago some shrewd remarks. Here they are:— *“Religious Liberty” is really coming home to roost over here in the colonies. A “Catholic” federal judge has jailed a Protestant county clerk, for refusing to issue same-sex marriage licences. The well-meaning defenders of the clerk keep citing “religious liberty,” not realizing that religious liberty is precisely the problem, not the solution. Amazing. We descend into moral chaos, and no one seems to understand why. “We descend into moral chaos, and nobody seems to understand why.” Well said, indeed! But “Traditionalists” who take Tradition seriously should be able to sort it out.*

This is because if I take Tradition seriously, I understand that DOCTRINE comes first, in other words the Catholic religion is not mind-mush, morality and the Mass, but it is doctrinal realities that govern both morals and the Mass. These realities start with the existence of Almighty God, on whom all creation depends every moment for its being upheld in existence, whereas He could let it all drop out of existence without in the least way changing Himself. He creates every human soul by Himself at the moment of its body’s conception for the purpose that it will use the free-will with which he endows that soul to choose to live and die in accordance with His unchanging moral Law, so that it can spend in Heaven its eternity in bliss with Himself. The free-will, to be genuine, means that souls can choose to break His Law, and if they do not repent, they will be choosing to spend eternity defying Him in Hell. So they themselves will be broken, but not His Law. That Law is summed up in the Ten Commandments, and it is not an arbitrary law, but it fits the human nature for which it was made, just as the manufacturer’s operating manual for a machine corresponds to the machine for which it was made.

Now the Sixth and Ninth of those Commandments instruct human beings to make the proper use of the reproductive mechanism built into their bodies. This mechanism is not a toy, but a sacred instrument designed by God for the forming of human

families here below to populate Heaven above. Neither two men alone nor two women alone but only a man and a woman together can have children and form a family, and since the populating of Heaven is a sacred affair, then any breaking of those two Commandments rapidly becomes grave enough to deserve eternal damnation. “God is not mocked” – Galatians VI, 7. Therefore same-sex frustration of the act of marriage is one of the four offences against God crying to Heaven for vengeance, as the Catholic Church teaches, and same-sex “marriage” is a mockery of God’s holy institution into the bargain. In all of this doctrine there is not one iota of chaos.

Then where does the chaos come from? From liberalism. From the false religion of liberalism. From making an idol of liberty. For in *Romans I* St Paul hammers home the point that this particular sin crying to Heaven for vengeance derives from idolatry. It is after men break the First Commandment that God gives them up to disgraceful practices against the Sixth Commandment, no doubt in the hope that the unmistakable foulness of their breaking the latter will wake them up to the foulness much greater in itself, but less easy to recognize, of breaking the former. That our liberty has become from an ideal an idol is in our own day more and more difficult to recognize, because idolizing religious liberty has been going on now for well over 200 years, and nothing seems more natural. Men have lost all sense of the true God. On the contrary, religious liberty is the supreme liberty, without which all other liberties seem little.

And liberty ends by lifting people’s minds right off their hinges:—“Any truth or reality pretending to impose itself on my mind is a diminution of my liberty, so I refuse to recognize it, unless it suits me. Many moral rules do not suit me. I refuse them, in the name of liberty. I descend thus into moral chaos, convinced that I am exercising a sacred right of mine, so that I cannot understand why I end up in chaos, mental then social. But I have myself unhinged my mind, and cut my society adrift.” The chaos is wholly comprehensible.

Kyrie eleison.

# HOST'S PARASITE – I

No. CDXLV (445)

*January 23, 2016*

Upon the good, to exist depends the bad.  
Thus Newchurch with no true Church can't be had.

The purpose of saying half a year ago that a priest is not obliged in every case to forbid a Catholic to attend the New Mass (NOM) was obviously not to say that the NOM is perfectly alright to attend. The NOM rite is, in itself, the central act of worship of the false man-centred religion of Vatican II, in whose wake it followed in 1969. In fact the obligation to stay away from the NOM is proportional to one's knowledge of how wrong it is. It has enormously contributed to countless Catholics losing their faith, almost without realizing it.

But there are two factors which even to this day have made it easy for Catholics to be deceived by the NOM. Firstly, it was imposed on the entire Latin-rite Church by what Paul VI did all he could to make look like the full force of his Papal authority, which in 1969 seemed immense. Still today the NOM passes for the "ordinary" rite, while the Mass of all time is officially discounted as the "extraordinary" rite, so that even 47 years later an honest Catholic can still feel obliged in obedience to attend the NOM. Of course in reality there can be no such obligation, because no Church law can oblige a Catholic to put his faith in danger, which he normally does by attending the NOM, such is its falsity.

And secondly, the NOM was introduced gradually, in a series of skilfully graduated changes, notably in 1962, 1964 and 1967, so that the wholesale revolution of 1969 found Catholics ready for novelty. In fact even today the NOM rite includes options for the celebrant which make it possible for him to celebrate the NOM either as a full-blooded ceremony of the new humanist religion, or as a ceremony resembling the true Mass closely enough to deceive many a Catholic that there is no significant difference between the old and the new rites. Of course in reality, as Archbishop Lefebvre always said, better the old rite in a modern language than the new rite in Latin, because of the diminution or downright falsification of the Catholic doctrine of the Mass in the NOM.

Moreover these two factors, the official imposition of the changes and their sometimes optional character intrinsic to the NOM, more than suffice to explain that to this day there must be multitudes of Catholics who want and mean to be Catholics and yet assume that the right way to be Catholics is to attend the NOM every Sunday. And who will dare say that out of these multitudes there are none who are still nourishing their faith by obeying what seems to them (subjectively) to be their (objective) duty? God is their judge, but for how many years did easily most followers of Catholic Tradition have to attend the NOM before they understood that their faith obliged them not to do so? And if the NOM had in all those years made them lose the faith, how would they have come to Catholic Tradition? Depending on how a celebrant uses the options in the NOM, not all the elements that can nourish faith are necessarily eliminated from it, especially if the Consecration is valid, a possibility which nobody who knows his sacramental theology can deny.

However, given the weakness of human nature and so the risk of encouraging Catholics to go with the new and easy religion by the least word said in favour of its central rite of worship, why say a word in favour of any feature of the Newchurch? For at least two reasons. Secondly, to ward off potentially pharisaical scorn of any believers outside of the Traditional movement, and firstly to ward off what is coming to be called “ecclesiavacantism,” namely the idea that the Newchurch has nothing Catholic left in it whatsoever. In theory the Newchurch is pure rot, but in practice that rot could not exist without something not yet rotted still being there to be rotted. Every parasite needs a host. Also, had this particular host, the true Church, completely disappeared, would not the gates of Hell have prevailed against it? Impossible (Mt.XVI, 18).

Kyrie eleison.



# APPROACHING “BLAST”

No. CDXLVI (446)

*January 30, 2016*

Beethoven’s music, blasted for three days,  
Should shock, console, enlighten and amaze.

Music is gravely misunderstood and its power seriously underestimated by liberals. They are still human enough to enjoy some music or other, logically some kind of trash – and to see how much music matters to people just try telling them that theirs is trash. But in any case liberals’ subjectivist ideology, whereby man is the master of reality (up to and including Almighty God), makes them deny that there is anything objective about music. So for liberals there is no such thing as a composer using certain means to attain certain ends, and there can be no saying that any one piece or kind of music is “better” than another. Music, they will say, is purely a matter of the listener’s mood or taste – “Beauty is in the eye of the beholder,” and horribly discordant music is just as “good” as the most famous music from the past.

Of course such liberals are completely wrong. A Chinese proverb says that “when the mode of the music changes, the walls of the city shake,” a truth amply illustrated by the advent of Rock music in the 1950’s and 1960’s. Plato knew so well the moral influence of music for good or ill that in his ideal Republic certain kinds of music would have been banned. Woe to parents today who do not care what music their children listen to! “It’s only music,” they will say, and so saying they will deserve to lose their children to the Pied Pipers of Rock. Music is supremely important, and it is objective in nature – is it not common sense that all military music and no lullaby will emphasize rhythm? But what do liberals care for common sense? They are doing everything possible to wipe it out. It is too real for their dream.

A major turning-point in modern times between men’s recognition and their refusal of the objective order of reality planted by God in all his works was the French Revolution (1789–1794). Because Beethoven’s life straddled that Revolution and gave to it its outstanding musical expression, some of his best-known works can be used to illustrate clearly certain objective truths concerning music. From Haydn and Mozart he inherited the objective order of the 18th century. To his successors it was mainly

Beethoven who bequeathed the increasing musical disorder (not without its beauties) of the 19th century, to be followed by the musical chaos and disintegration (with exceptions) of supposedly “serious” music in the 20th and 21st centuries. Beethoven might then be called the grandfather or great-grandfather of Rock. That statement may so shock many a lover of Beethoven that it must immediately be qualified by saying that it took a great musician to launch the destruction of music.

Fast approaching – February 19 to 21 – is the “Beethoven Blast” to be held here in Broadstairs from the Friday 18h00, to the Sunday mid-day. A young American pianist who can sight-read nearly all of the 32 piano sonatas and Liszt’s piano versions for two hands of the nine symphonies, has offered to play as many of the sonatas as can be made to fit into one weekend, together with extracts from the symphonies chosen to illustrate the nature of music and how Beethoven works. The idea of the “Blast” originated in sheer self-indulgence, but then there occurred the temptation to throw it open to whoever might like either just to listen to the music (which should be a feast in itself for lovers of Beethoven), or to find out why liberals are so wrong, in music as in everything else.

So if anyone is interested besides readers who have already signed on, let them come between the times mentioned above. Bed and breakfast in the off-season of Broadstairs should be findable on the Internet, and if you let us know when you may plan to come, we may be able to manage in-house lunch and supper. In all things may God be served.

Kyrie eleison.

## HOST AND PARASITE – II

No. CDXLVII (447)

February 6, 2016

A leprous Mother some sons will desert.  
Others will get too close, not being alert.

Two weeks ago these “Comments” stepped back onto a minefield, and defended the position that there is still something Catholic in what has become of the Catholic Church since Vatican II. That position is highly disputed. For example on the one side the present leaders of the Society of St Pius X act as though the official Church in Rome is still so Catholic that the SSPX cannot do without its official recognition. On the other side many souls that really have the Catholic faith utterly repudiate the idea that there is still anything Catholic whatsoever left in the “Church” now being led by “Pope” Francis. What follows is just one attempt to discern what truth may be on both sides.

At the heart of the problem is modernism, which was the essential disease of Vatican II. Modernism is necessarily, by its very nature, a uniquely slippery animal. This is because its basic principle is to adapt Catholicism to the intrinsically anti-Catholic modern world. Thus Conciliar Popes like Paul VI and Benedict XVI wanted both to break and not to break with Catholic Tradition. For any sane mind this is impossible, because it is contradictory. But since these Popes get elected to correspond to the modern world, then they do not have sane minds, instead they have the contradiction of reality in their bloodstream. And since they have had nearly 50 years to conform the Church to their insanity, from top to bottom, then there has emerged a Church so different from the pre-conciliar Church that it is a reality deserving the name of Newchurch.

Moreover, even where a pre-conciliar Catholic practice, like for example Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, is maintained in today’s Newchurch, the mental foundation on which it rests in the heads of those attending is liable to be anything but solid, because the doctrine of the Real Presence is now both Traditional and not Traditional, it having been consecrated by up-dated priests, who are both priests and not priests. They are priests if you want, but also and at the same time merely

presiders if you want. Whatever you feel like is what is true, because the mind is unhooked from objective reality. It is swimming in nice subjective feelings, and unaware of what it is doing, because everybody (almost) is doing it. To anyone having the real Faith, such lack of objectivity is far from nice, it is nauseating. No wonder such souls can repudiate the totality of the Newchurch.

But if one respects reality, one is bound to admit that there is still faith in the Newchurch. A layman tells me that his father has faithfully attended the NOM for the last 45 years, and still has the faith. A priest tells me that he can remember a laywoman presenting to Archbishop Lefebvre himself her reasons for needing to attend the NOM, and he merely shrugged his shoulders. And I could multiply these testimonies that have come to me of the Catholic faith surviving the onslaught of all that is wrong in the NOM. The reason for these testimonies being real should be obvious. As an essential part of the subjective and ambiguous religion, the NOM can be what you make of it. A priest can celebrate it “decently,” a Catholic can attend it “devoutly.” The inverted commas are to placate the hard-liners who will insist that with the NOM there can be neither true decency nor true devotion, but when they say such things, I think that they are flying in the face of reality. Thank goodness, God is judge! No doubt the NOM as it stands is undermining and eroding Catholic decency and devotion all the time, but to say that there is by now nothing at all of these left in the “Newchurch” seems to me to be a gross exaggeration.

Not that the SSPX leaders are right to be wanting to be re-incorporated in the Newchurch, far from it. Whatever sheep therein are not yet infected by subjectivism are wide open to the terrible danger, nor are shepherds immune. Woe to the bishops who failed to keep subjectivism outside of the Catholic Church. They bear a tremendous responsibility.

Kyrie eleison.

# SLIPPERY ANIMAL

No. CDXLVIII (448)

*February 13, 2016*

People today are not normal or sane.  
All history shows no comparable bane.

“Modernism is necessarily, by its very nature, a uniquely slippery animal.” Modernism being the present deadly enemy of the Catholic Church, it can never be analysed enough. As enemy of the Church in particular, it can be defined as that movement of thought and belief which holds that the Church must be adapted to the modern world by the appearance of Catholicism being maintained while its substance is changed. It has infected Catholics without number since it gained official approval from the very top of the Church at Vatican II, and it has set many cardinals, bishops and priests on the road to eternal perdition, let alone laity, by undermining their Catholic faith. Let us see again why it is slippery, and uniquely slippery.

It is a slippery animal because like all heresies it had to disguise itself to seem acceptable to its target, believing Catholics. So it is constantly using ambiguous formulae of words interpretable in a Catholic or anti-catholic sense. The Catholics piously accept the Catholic sense and swallow the words, only to have the modernists turn them to poison by exploiting the anti-catholic sense. Vatican II is ambiguous from start to finish, choosing formulae of words that can slip and slide between the Church and the modern world, so as to hide the intrinsic mutual contradiction of these two. To Paul VI, believing profoundly in both Church and world (as he conceived them), such formulae came instinctively and abundantly. The documents of his Council, Vatican II, are shot through with ambiguity. Yet by these ambiguities Paul VI really thought he would save both Church and world, exactly as Bishop Fellay now hopes that by talking out of both sides of his mouth he will save both Catholic Tradition and the Council. Vain hope! God “detests the double tongue” (Prov. VIII, 13). It has always served to trick Catholics into abandoning their faith.

But more than just slippery, modernism is amongst all heresies uniquely slippery, because as Pius X said in “Pascendi,” it is the heresy of heresies, like a main sewer collecting in itself all the filth of all the minor sewers, or particular heresies. This is

because it is the product (and producer) of minds that have slipped anchor from anchorage in any truth whatsoever, so that any counter-truth or heresy is entirely at home in modernism. And this is because its fundamental principle is philosophical, the human mind's supposed inability to know anything whatsoever beyond what appears to men's five external senses. Such a mind is like a dirty wine-bottle. It dirties anything poured into it, even the finest of wines or the sublimest of truths. For while any other heresy attacks a particular truth of the Faith, the philosophical error at the root of modernism undermines universal truth, even while it can pretend that it is not attacking any truth in particular. For instance Benedict XVI would no doubt be horrified if he were accused of disbelieving any Article of the Creed, but that does not stop him from being ready to "up-date" them all.

Now never have so many minds slipped all anchor in objective truth as today, such slipping being man's final liberation, whereby reality can no longer impose itself on me, but I can impose myself on all reality. I have taken the place of God. Thus too many Catholics were infected by today's world and welcomed modernism when it reared its head again at Vatican II, because here was the Pope himself giving the apparent seal of Catholic approval to their undermining of all Catholic Truth. They were free, and still Catholic. Cry freedom throughout the Church!

Then how deal with this "uniquely slippery animal"? Certainly not by going down to Rome to mix with its main victims and perpetrators, the present officials at the top of the Church. Satan himself might not have a long enough spoon to sup safely with these (objective) foxes and sharks and wolves, all the more dangerous for their possible (subjective) unawareness of their own condition. Pray the Rosary for Our Lady to build around your heads and hearts her own protective armour.

Kyrie eleison.

# BISHOPS

No. CDXLIX (449)

February 20, 2016

The SSPX is no way “out of the woods.”  
Resistant bishops must “deliver the goods”!

Ever since the General Chapter of July, 2012, when under Bishop Fellay’s direction the Society of St Pius X took a decisive lurch towards a compromise agreement with Conciliar Rome, Catholics of Tradition have wondered where the two other SSPX bishops stand, Bishop Tissier de Mallerais (BpT) and Bishop de Galarreta (BpG), because both have been rather discreet in public since that time. However, firm words spoken by each of them last month have raised hopes for the future of the SSPX. Are the hopes justified? Catholics may need to remain on their guard . . .

The Confirmations sermon of BpT given on January 31 in Saarbrücken in Germany could not have been more upright or clear. For instance: *In the SSPX’s confrontation with Rome, it may never go in for compromise or double-dealing. We can never negotiate with Rome so long as the representatives of the Newchurch (sic) cling to the errors of Vatican II. Any talk of ours with Rome must be unambiguous, and have as its purpose the conversion of the Newchurch representatives back to our one and only truth of Catholic Tradition. No compromise or double-dealing until they have got over their Conciliar errors, and have converted back to the Truth.*

Admirable words! Uprightness is not BpT’s problem. He is no politician, God bless him. His problem is that when it comes to putting words into action, his “Fiftiesism” makes him obey his Superior and fall back in line with the politicians of SSPX HQ in Menzingen. Nothing indicates that this will not happen again this time, but we may always pray that, as the proverb says, “Even a worm will turn.” BpT is far from a worm, but he is hiding from himself, or genuinely cannot see, the full malice of Menzingen’s action. It is not just the unity and welfare of the SSPX which is at stake, but the Catholic Faith.

On the contrary BpG is a politician. Unfortunately we do not have the full text of the conference he gave in Bailly, France, on January 17, because his exact words count, so we can only quote from a summary of his main thoughts: *Rome’s latest theological and*

*canonical proposals for a Rome-SSPX agreement remain unacceptable, but the Pope certainly wants an agreement and he is perfectly capable of overriding his own officials and of imposing a “unilateral” recognition on the SSPX. Such a recognition could definitely harm the SSPX internally, but if the SSPX had done nothing to obtain it, then there is nothing that the SSPX could do about it. However, Providence would once more watch over the Archbishop’s work.*

But, your Excellency, Menzingen has now for many years been doing all it can by political negotiation to arrive at official recognition by Rome, and its eventual “unilateral” arrival would be a mere pretence to deceive Traditionalists so as to sell out the SSPX under cover of claiming, no doubt with Rome’s permission behind the scenes, that it was all Rome’s fault. But the fact would remain that the Archbishop’s Society would finally be betrayed, and you with your own “*No, no, a thousand times no . . . but possibly, yes*” would have to answer for not having done all you could and should have done to block its betrayal.

In brief, that emergency lighting system of the Universal Church in Conciliar darkness, which is the SSPX, is itself flickering and in danger of no longer giving light. Therefore that repair team to sustain the emergency lighting, which is the “Resistance,” is still needed, and that team needs a sufficiency of good foremen. A third bishop for the “Resistance” is planned, as last year for March 19 at the monastery near Nova Friburgo in Brazil. He is its Prior, Fr Thomas Aquinas, faithful warrior and veteran of the post-Conciliar war for the Faith. May God be with him, and with all the humble and faithful servants of God.

Kyrie eleison.



## BISHOPS VALID? – II

No. CDL (450)

February 27, 2016

The Newchurch is ambiguous, through and through,  
But innocent souls within it still we view.

A recent study by a competent Society of St Pius X theologian concerning the validity of the Newrite of Consecration of Newbishops introduced in 1969, provides remarkable confirmation of the second point of Freemasonry's three-point plan to destroy the Catholic Church, which the dying Cardinal Liénart (1884–1973) allegedly revealed on his death-bed. The Cardinal was a leading neo-modernist at Vatican II, and surely a Freemason himself. Before quoting from the summary of the Cardinal's testimony which appeared in these "Comments" (#121 of October 31, 2009), let us remind readers that the validity of a Catholic sacrament requires, besides a valid Minister, a valid Form and Matter (words and actions at the heart of the ceremony) and the sacramental Intention to do what the Church does. All other words to be spoken at the ceremony constitute the Rite, surrounding and framing the Form. Now from EC 121:—

*According to the Cardinal, Freemasonry's first objective at the Council was to break the Mass by so altering the Catholic Rite as to undermine in the long run the celebrant's Catholic Intention: "to do what the Church does." Gradually the Newrite was to induce priests and laity alike to take the Mass rather for a "memorial" or "sacred meal" than for a propitiatory sacrifice. Freemasonry's second objective was to break the Apostolic Succession by a Newrite of Consecration that would eventually undermine the bishops' power of Orders, both by a Newform not automatically invalidating but ambiguous enough to sow doubt, and above all by a Newrite which as a whole would eventually dissolve the consecrating bishop's sacramental Intention. This would have the advantage of breaking the Apostolic Succession so gently that nobody would even notice ( . . . )*

*Do not today's Newrites of Mass and Episcopal Consecration correspond exactly to the Masonic plan as unveiled by the Cardinal? Ever since these Newrites were introduced in the late 1960's and early 1970's, many serious Catholics have refused to believe that they could be used validly. Alas, they are not automatically invalid. How much simpler it would be, if*

*they were. They are worse. Their sacramental Newform is Catholic enough to persuade many a celebrant that they can be validly used, but the Newrite and Newform are designed as a whole to be so ambiguous and so suggestive of a non-Catholic interpretation as to invalidate the sacrament over time by corrupting the catholic Intention of any celebrant who is either too "obedient," or is not watching and praying enough. Newrites thus valid enough to get themselves accepted by nearly all Catholics in the short term, but ambiguous enough to invalidate the sacraments in the long term, constitute a trap satanically subtle.*

There is no room left in this week's "Comments" to do justice to the recent article of Fr Alvaro Calderón, but let us present its grand lines (whose justification will have to wait for another issue of these "Comments"): the Newrite of episcopal Consecration is an entirely new Rite. As such, is it valid? It is certainly illegitimate, because no Pope has the right to make such a break with Catholic Tradition. On the other hand in the context of the Newrite and its institution, the Newmatter, Newform and Newintention are very probably valid, because they signify what needs to be signified and most of their elements come from Rites accepted by the Church. But the validity is not certain because the break with Tradition is not legitimate, and because the Newrite is only similar to Rites approved by the Church, and all the changes go in a modernist direction. Therefore the absolute need for certain validity in sacramental Rites applies: until the restored Magisterium of the Church pronounces that the Newrite of Consecration is valid, then to be safe, Newbishops should be reconsecrated conditionally, and Newpriests ordained only by Newbishops should be re-ordained conditionally.

Neo-modernism is "uniquely slippery." It was designed to be so.

Kyrie eleison.

## BISHOPS VALID? – III

No. CDLI (451)

March 5, 2016

A devilish ambiguity and doubt  
Are turning Church and Bishops inside out.

To present Fr Calderón's arguments for the Newrite of Consecration of Bishops being "most likely valid" does not mean defending the Novus Ordo as a whole, nor saying that there is no problem with this Newrite. It does mean that the problem must be weighed not by hothead emotions but by the Church's sacramental theology, a domain in which it is apt to happen, as the proverb says, that "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." Here are Fr Calderón's arguments, still heavily summarized:—

What is needed to guarantee the validity of a sacramental Rite is its long-standing approval by the Church. Because the Newrite of Episcopal Consecration (NEC) is an entirely new rite, fabricated under Paul VI in the wake of Vatican II, it has no such guarantee. Moreover that Council's anti-liturgical spirit, quasi-heretical collegiality and anti-authoritarian spirit, forming the context in which the NEC was fabricated, combine to raise a doubt as to its validity: has the new Matter in the NEC been so changed as to invalidate the sacrament? Does the NEC show its promulgator's new Ritual Intention to make a Rite to consecrate bishops to "do what the Church does" (and always has done)? And has the Form been officially established by the Church, and does it sufficiently express not necessarily the grace of the bishopric to be conferred, but at least the episcopal order which necessarily implies that grace?

The new Matter of the NEC raises no doubts, because it has not been significantly changed from the Traditional matter. On the other hand the promulgator's new Ritual Intention is problematic, because Paul VI may have been the highest authority in the Church, nevertheless all his liturgical reforms are shot through with his typical modernist desire both to "do what the Church does" and at the same time not to do it. This contradiction characterised almost his entire pontificate, causing untold confusion throughout the Church. Thus the NEC as a whole betrays his democratic spirit, altering radically in several places the Traditional concept of a Catholic bishop and his authority. This new Ritual Intention is ambiguous.

As for the NEC's new Form, it was established by the highest Church authority, Pope Paul VI, but not with his Extraordinary infallibility, nor with the Church's Ordinary infallibility (which never breaks with Tradition), so that a final Church judgment upon its validity must wait for the restoration of the Church's sane Magisterium, presently eclipsed. Meanwhile as a sacramental Form it does seem valid, because "Accept the Principal Spirit" is a Form similar to other Forms approved by the Church, and any intrinsic ambiguity as to the order of bishops is wholly clarified by the immediately surrounding extrinsic Rite.

However, since Paul VI established this Newform both meaning and not meaning to break with the Traditional concept of a Catholic bishop, then in accordance with the doctrine of Leo XIII's "Apostolicae Curae," had his dissolving of episcopal authority been clear and explicit, his NEC consecrations would certainly be as invalid as Anglican Orders. As it is, the modernist errors are only implicit in the context of the NEC's institution. But it is a dark shadow overhanging the validity of the NEC.

Fr Calderón's conclusion was given here last week: the Matter, Form and Ritual Intention of the NEC are certainly illegitimate because of their break with Tradition, but they are most probably valid because they signify what needs to be signified and most of their elements come from Rites accepted by the Church. However, that validity is not certain because the Ritual Intention to break without breaking with Tradition is illegitimate, the NEC is only similar to Church-approved Rites, and the changes go all in a modernist direction. But the sacraments call for absolutely certain validity, especially the consecration of bishops on whom the Church hangs. Therefore newbishops and newpriests were best conditionally re-consecrated and re-ordained.

Kyrie eleison.

# PEACE, WAR

No. CDLII (452)

*March 12, 2016*

The little within our power, let's do, then God  
May spare that much the well deserved rod.

Here are some small good news and some big bad news, but the balance may be a little redressed by the bad news being of the world while the good news is of the Church. First, the triple good news.

At the beginning of February at the “Resistance” Seminary of St Grignon de Montfort near Angers in France there was a meeting of the half dozen French priests of the Priestly Union of Marcel Lefebvre, USML for short. Bishop Faure presided. Fr Bruno, Benedictine monk, co-ordinated. The USML still has no structure worth speaking of, any more than did the remnant of faithful priests surviving the disaster of the NOM and Vatican II, but vigorous discussion of action to be taken did not prevent a meeting of minds. Faith may hold the USML friends together for a while yet.

Next, on the following day five young men, three from France, one each from England and Italy, received the cassock at the hands of Bishop Faure in a Pontifical Mass celebrated in the church of the Dominican Friary in Avrillé. Under the impulse of the USML the Seminary opened last autumn with eight seminarians, only one of whom is no longer there. They receive a large part of their daily schooling in the same Friary from the Dominican priests who are thus repaying a debt of their own origins to the Archbishop's Society and Seminary in Écône, where their three pioneers, still their leaders of today, received their initial schooling in philosophy and theology in the late 1970's and early '80's. Truly, “What goes around, comes around,” but from Bishop Fellay's Newsociety, hell-bound for Conciliar Rome, the Dominicans parted company prudently last year.

And the last part of the good news from France is that by no means all the SSPX priests in the French District are blindly following their misleader. How could they, when the present head of Conciliar Rome commits day by day, in word and deed, one outrage after another against the Catholic Faith, as though he were set upon

destroying the entire Church? The Archbishop's Society may be sinking, and it may yet sink in this overwhelming storm of liberalism and neo-modernism, but it has not yet sunk. We must pray to the Archbishop in case he can save his Society from the deluded liberals into whose hands it has fallen.

The bad news from the world (see <http://www.tfmetalsreport.com/blog/7422/dangerous-moves-new-cold-war>) is that the Cold War between the West and Russia is heating up again and becoming more dangerous than ever since the Cuban missiles crisis of 1961. In particular at the end of January the United States government announced its decision to put a fully equipped combat brigade, mobile but permanent, in the countries of East Europe bordering directly on Russia, from the Baltic States down to Syria. Never has US military force been placed so close to Russia. The previous closest was Berlin. And the arms race is back on. Both sides are modernising their nuclear weapons, now much more expensive and dangerous, being smaller, more precise, more controllable and therefore more "usable." The nuclear clock is ticking – at 11h57, say some – and there is no debate.

How can the Western media not be making known a situation developing so dramatically? Because they are controlled by the enemies of God and man who want the Third World War to give them that global dictatorship to which they are convinced that they are entitled. Is there a human hope of stopping them from inflicting upon all of us their folly? It depends not on them but upon Almighty God, whom they are serving as a scourge for ourselves, godless mankind. Let each of us pray the Rosary and do our daily duty. We can do little more. We can do no less.

Kyrie eleison.

# THIRD BISHOP

No. CDLIII (453)

March 19, 2016

Dom Thomas, a monk with faith and charity filled,  
And now a bishop, by God (and readers) willed.

On the day of the consecration, please God, of Dom Thomas Aquinas as third bishop for today's Catholic "Resistance," it seems appropriate to reproduce the testimony of a close friend of his, Professor Carlos Nougué, now leading a House of Studies attached to Dom Thomas' Monastery of the Holy Cross. This testimony, which many of you may not have seen, is only slightly adapted from the original, which is accessible on the excellent Mexican site, *Non Possumus*. Note in particular the good influence of Corção, the close connection with Archbishop Lefebvre, the refusal to approach neo-modernist Rome and the Stalinist methods of Bp Fellay.

Kyrie eleison.!

*Miguel Ferreira da Costa was born in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1954. Before beginning his career in the law, he studied at Saint Benedict College in Rio de Janeiro, where I had the opportunity to be his classmate for a brief while. He took part in the traditionalist and anti-modernist movement organized around Gustavo Corção and Permanencia magazine; then he began his life of "faithful warrior and veteran of the post-Conciliar war for the Faith" – he quit the law to become a monk with the name of Thomas Aquinas, in the French monastery of le Barroux, where Dom Gérard was Prior at that time, and he was ordained priest in 1980, in Écône, by Archbishop Lefebvre. There he enjoyed the friendship, the example and the teaching of the SSPX's Founder.*

*In 1987 he came to Brazil with a group of monks from le Barroux to found the Monastery of the Holy Cross in Nova Friburgo, up in the hills behind Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. But in the meantime Dom Gérard, despite the grave warnings of the Archbishop, was advancing towards an agreement with Conciliar Rome, to which Dom Thomas Aquinas was also opposed. A split was inevitable. The Monastery of the Holy Cross, with Archbishop Lefebvre's support, became independent in 1988, while retaining good relations with the SSPX. However, upon written advice of the Archbishop, the SSPX was not to have jurisdiction over him, because as Prior of the Monastery he needed autonomy.*

*Providential advice, because relations between the SSPX and the Monastery were deteriorating, especially with the approach of the SSPX to neo-modernist Rome. Dom Thomas refused to sing at Sunday Mass the Te Deum asked for by Bp. Fellay to celebrate Benedict XVI's Motu Proprio on the Mass. Similarly, for the "lifting of the excommunications" by the same Pope, Dom Thomas wrote to Bp. Fellay a letter refusing to follow him towards an agreement with Conciliar Rome. Thereupon I myself saw Bp. De Galarreta and Fr. Bouchacourt when they came to the Monastery to tell Dom Thomas that he had 15 days to leave the Monastery if he wanted the Monastery to continue receiving help and the sacraments (including Ordinations) from the SSPX.*

*I wrote to Bp. Fellay to complain about this injustice. He answered me that Dom Thomas had a mental problem, and as long as he did not leave the Monastery, it would not receive the Society's help. I replied: "Then I should have the same mental problem, because I have known him for twelve years and I never realized." It was truly like Stalinism, with its psychiatric hospitals for opponents of the Stalinist regime. But Dom Thomas hesitated: if he left the Monastery, that would be its ruin regarding the Faith, but if he stayed, he would deprive it of needed help. Then Bp. Williamson wrote to Dom Thomas promising the Monastery all the sacraments it would need. This meant Dom Thomas could stay.*

*This was enough for all of us to start reacting: it was the beginning of what is now known as the Resistance, which had as its first organ the website called SPES, no longer on line. The Monastery then became a reception center for refugee priests from the SSPX with nowhere to live. It was where Bp. Faure was consecrated, and now it is where Dom Thomas Aquino Ferreira da Costa himself will be consecrated, my spiritual father and the closest friend that God could have given to me.*



# ARCHBISHOP'S LEGACY – I

No. CDLIV (454)

*March 26, 2016*

The Archbishop died, twenty-five years ago.  
Have his successors followed faithfully? No.

Yesterday, March 25, was the 25th anniversary of the death of a great man of God, Archbishop Lefebvre, to whom so many Catholics keeping the Faith today have such a great debt. When in the 1960's the Revolutionary demons of the modern world succeeded in bringing under their yoke the mass of Catholic churchmen either during or after the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965), it was the Archbishop who almost single-handed stood by that Catholic Truth which Catholic Authority, blinded or cowed, was abandoning. For indeed to obey that Authority given over to the principles of the Revolution, Catholics had to abandon the Truth of the Church's unchanging Tradition. Or else, to remain faithful to that Truth, they had to enter into "disobedience" to the Church Authorities.

Of course neither the Archbishop nor the Society of St Pius X which he founded in 1970 were in real disobedience, because Catholic Authority is the indispensable servant of Catholic Truth: indispensable, because Truth without Authority is torn to pieces amid the warring opinions of fallible men, but servant, because Authority is a means and not an end, the means of protecting and preserving that infallible Truth of Christ which alone can save souls. To this immutable Church Tradition Archbishop Lefebvre remained faithful to the end, yet without scorning or defying those Church Authorities which condemned him to the end. On the contrary he did all he could have done, in fact at a given moment, on his own admission, even more than he should have done, to help them to see the Truth and serve it, for the good of the whole Church, but in vain.

That is when, to ensure the survival of the Truth of salvation, in June of 1988 he consecrated four bishops without that permission of Church Authorities which is normally necessary. They must have hoped that his proceeding without their permission would spell the ruin of his Society, but on the contrary it flourished, because by now a significant number of souls had climbed out of their pre-Conciliar

“obedience” to understand that Truth has to come first, and that truthful bishops are essential to the survival of the Church’s Truth.

But what happened to the Society which he left behind him when he died two and a half years later? His Catholic wisdom and personal charisma were no longer there to protect them from the magnetic pull of pre-Conciliar “obedience,” which took the form of seemingly reasonable propositions of a diplomatic compromise between Conciliar Authority and Catholic Tradition. False “obedience,” preferring Authority to Truth, now crept back at the top of the Society from which the Archbishop had exorcised it, and within a few more years his Society was hardly recognisable as its misleaders went to Rome, cap in hand, begging for official recognition from the Church Authorities.

Now Truth has no right to put itself in a position of begging for anything from a group of liars – “Catholicism is Revolutionary” is a dreadful lie – but the Society’s misleaders, then and now, justified their humiliating of Truth by appealing to the Archbishop’s example. For years, they said, he went down to Rome seeking official approval of the Society, and they were doing nothing else. But what might have seemed similar was in reality quite different. While they were going down to Rome in pursuit of some political agreement, by which, as became clear at the latest in the spring of 2012, they were ready to compromise doctrine, on the contrary the Archbishop only ever went down to Rome for the good of the Faith and the Church. For him the official approval of the Society by Church Authority was only ever a means to help that Authority back towards Tradition and Truth, and when that Authority in the spring of 1988 demonstrated once and for all its refusal to look after Tradition, then the Archbishop broke off all negotiations and diplomatic contacts, and roundly declared that they would only resume when Rome returned to doctrinal Truth. In fact the Archbishop’s successors had never understood him. And today? See next week’s “Comments.”

Kyrie eleison.

## ARCHBISHOP'S LEGACY – II

No. CDLV (455)

*April 2, 2016*

Structure, or none? The Faith is where?  
Wherever it is, I must go there!

In 2012 the Archbishop's successors at the head of his Society of St Pius X, having failed to understand his fundamental putting of Catholic Truth before Catholic Authority, claimed falsely to be following his example when at the Society's General Chapter of that summer they prepared to put Truth back under Authority by opening the door to some political and non-doctrinal agreement with the liars of Rome – "Catholicism is Revolutionary" is a monstrous lie. For years now these successors have been spreading rumours that the agreement is imminent, but Rome has them where it wants them, by their own fault, and risks continuing to extract concessions such as, possibly, the disastrous interview of March 2 granted by the Superior General to a professional predator. Conciliar Rome never forgets what the SSPX seems no longer to want to remember – Catholic Tradition and Vatican II are absolutely irreconcilable.

However, the Archbishop has disciples who have not forgotten this. They are going under the name of the "Resistance," which is a movement rather than an organization, as is only logical. Clinging to Truth against the false Authority both of Rome and now of the SSPX, any internal authority amongst them can at best be supplied, i.e. an abnormal authority supplied invisibly by the Church in case of emergency for the salvation of souls. But such authority, by the invisibility of its transmission (contrast the visible ceremonies by which many kinds of authority amongst men are transmitted), is that much weaker and more contestable than normal authority in the Church, which descends always, ultimately, from the Pope. Therefore the "Resistance" has the strength of Truth but a weakness of Authority normally essential to protect Catholic Truth.

Surely resistant Catholics, inside or outside of Tradition, have to take into account the many consequences of this split between Truth and Authority, imposed by Vatican II on the entire Church. God's Supreme Shepherd being supremely struck by Conciliar folly, how can God's sheep not be supremely scattered (cf. Zach. XIII, 7: Mt. XXVI,

31)? Not to be suffering, Catholics would have to not belong to the Catholic Church. Is that what they want? Then Catholics for the time being should be neither surprised by betrayals nor disappointed by divisions. The Devil is being given for the moment almost a free hand to cause divisions (“diabolein” in Greek), and when Catholics are all fighting for eternal salvation the divisions are frequently bitter. Patience.

Next, from Conciliar Popes there can no longer be the lifeblood of true Catholic Authority flowing down into Catholic institutions, and so Catholic persons can no longer depend upon Catholic institutions like they should normally be able to do. Rather, any such institutions have to depend for Truth upon the persons, as we have seen the SSPX depending on Archbishop Lefebvre. But persons without institutional backing or control are always liable to be fallible, and so it seems unwise to expect that any grouping of Catholics today for Truth is going to attract large numbers. Catholics may naturally long for structure, hierarchy, Superiors and obedience, but these cannot be fabricated out of thin air. Surely remnants are the order of the day. Patience.

In conclusion, Catholics striving to keep the Faith must take their well-deserved punishment, renounce all human illusions and fabrications, and beg in prayer for Almighty God to intervene. When enough souls turn to him for his solution instead of theirs, they will recognize that his Providence provided it for them in the form of the Devotion of the First Saturdays of the month, to make reparation to his Mother. For when enough reparation is made, then he will give to his Vicar on earth the grace to Consecrate Russia to her Immaculate Heart, and then order begins to be restored, as he has promised. For the practice of that Devotion, do not miss next week’s “Comments.”

Kyrie eleison.

# DIVINE SOLUTION

No. CDLVI (456)

*April 9, 2016*

For twenty little ticks, Heaven is mine.  
A Catholic must be crazy to decline!

The last two issues of these “Comments” concluded that in today’s confusion in the Universal Church, descending from Popes possessed by Revolutionary ideals, Catholics should turn to God for God’s own solution, because he cannot abandon souls that have not first abandoned him. This solution exists, not complicated, accessible to all, guaranteeing eternal salvation, requiring only a little faith, humility and effort. It is the Devotion to the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary by the practice of the Five First Saturdays, in a spirit of reparation for the insults, blasphemies and outrages committed against the Mother of God.

Why reparation to the Blessed Virgin Mary? Because God, knowing from eternity how perverse the world would become towards its end, gave to his Mother, as St Grignon de Montfort foresaw in the 18th century, a special motherly part to play from the upheaval of the French Revolution (1789) onwards. Through the 19th century she was indeed able, for instance through Lourdes, to reach a multitude of souls that liberalism and scientism could otherwise have damned, but by the 20th century too many souls were spurning even her motherly care. So as God had given to his Church in the 17th century the Devotion to his own Sacred Heart, so in the 20th century he gave the Devotion to his Mother’s Immaculate Heart, with the warning to mankind that this would be his last such gift before world’s end. And insults being for him worse to his Mother than to himself, then men’s spurning of her special efforts to save them called for special reparation.

She herself from May to October of 1917 in Fatima, Portugal, presented her Heart as the remedy for the ills of mankind which were about to be made much worse by the outbreak of the Russian Revolution that same October. And as the world plunged downhill in the 1920’s, to the point where today countless Catholics are holding onto their faith only by their fingertips, she gave to any soul a sure and easy means of ensuring its eternal salvation if only it will take, for once in its life, a little trouble on

her behalf: to make reparation on five first Saturdays of the month successively for outrages against 1) her Immaculate Conception, 2) her perpetual Virginity, 3) her universal spiritual Motherhood, 4) her images and statues and 5) the little children being cut off from access to her. Press [HERE](#) to see the attached flyer for precise details.

The offer of so much in exchange for so relatively little is incredible, but as the flyer says, it makes sense. God has known from eternity all the chaos now closing in on us in which the Fifth Age of the Church is drawing to its close. We are losing our health, our families, our freedom, our countries, our priests, our sacraments, our Church, and soon very possibly our lives. Our world is sinking into a chaos organized by the enemies of God to wipe out the last traces of him. All this of course he knows, and the growing difficulty, even seeming impossibility, of leading Catholic lives. Therefore he offers us the guarantee of salvation if we will make just a little effort to make reparation to his Mother. Thereafter we may go crazy, go to prison, go to our deaths, even lose the faith, but at the moment of death we have God's promise that she will be there with all graces necessary for salvation. How can any believing Catholic not take up on the offer? There are certainly priests in all parts of the Church who will do their best to help.

But the least we can do for our part is fulfil exactly what Heaven requests, notably the five distinct intentions of reparation, and here is where the flyer must help. Ordered in bulk on paper from the Fatima Centre in Canada, or downloaded on paper, it presents 20 little boxes to tick for the diagonal climb from modern storm to Heavenly calm. Children love ticking boxes. It does no harm to adults. All aboard for Heaven!

Kyrie eleison.

# ERRONEOUS VISION

No. CDLVII (457)

*April 16, 2016*

A leader of the Society seems to think  
That Rome will make it float. 'Twill make it sink!

Fr. Franz Schmidberger, former Superior General of the Society of St Pius X from 1982 to 1994 and present Rector of the Society's German Seminary in Zaitzkofen, Bavaria, has recently put into circulation "Considerations on the Church and on the Society's position within the Church." In three pages firmly promoting the acceptance by the Society from Pope Francis of a Personal Prelature which would bring the Society back into the official Church underneath the Pope, Fr Schmidberger shows a very inadequate grasp of the problem in Conciliar Rome, hardly mentioning Vatican II.

He begins by presenting the Catholic Church as containing human and fallible elements which required Archbishop Lefebvre to found in 1970 the SSPX to save the priesthood, the Mass and the Social Kingship of Christ the King. In 1975 the SSPX was condemned by the official Church, but it thrived. The consecration of four Society bishops in 1988 manifested the contradiction between Rome and the SSPX, but the Archbishop still strove, after as before, for a solution. From 2000 Romans, honest or dishonest, also sought for a solution. Now in 2016 they are easing up on their demands for the SSPX to accept the Council and the New Mass.

COMMENT: This is a relatively superficial view of the utterly radical attack launched against the Faith and Truth itself by Freemasonic churchmen during and after Vatican II. Fr. Schmidberger sees merely misguided Roman churchmen whose coming to their Catholic senses can be seriously helped forward if only the SSPX is officially recognized. Does he have any idea of that leprosy of the modernist mind which the SSPX would much more likely catch than cure if it went in with these Romans?

Secondly, Fr Schmidberger presents half a dozen arguments in favour of accepting the Personal Prelature. The SSPX must regain normality. It must not by its present "exile" lose the sense of the Church. Doors would open in Rome. The SSPX urgently needs

Rome's permission to consecrate more bishops. A good sign is the anxiety of some modernists at the prospect of the SSPX's normalisation. And finally, how else can the Church's present crisis be solved than by the SSPX coming out of its "exile" and converting the Romans?

COMMENT: The SSPX convert these Romans? What an illusion! Again, Fr Schmidberger has little to no idea of the deep perversion of modernism which he is up against. It is not "normal" for Catholics to submit to modernists. "Exile" need not mean loss of the sense of the Church. No important doors would open in Rome. The Faith does not need bishops approved by modernists. Any anxious modernists are naive – the real modernists know that they will convert the Society and not the other way round, once they can close the trap. And finally the Church crisis will certainly not be solved by a deluded SSPX joining Rome, but only by God, whose arm is not shortened by the wickedness of men (Isaiah, LIX, 1).

Finally, Fr Schmidberger answers some objections: Pope Francis may not be a good Pope, but he has the jurisdiction to normalize the SSPX. The opinion of the "Resistance" does not matter since it has no sense of the Church and is divided. The SSPX will not be muzzled because Rome will "accept it as it is" (*illusion*), nor will it lose its identity, because with God's help it will convert Rome (*illusion*). Nor will it fail to resist like all other Traditional Congregations have failed that have gone in with Rome, because it is Rome that is begging while the SSPX is choosing (*illusion*), and because the SSPX has resistant bishops (*illusion*), and because it will be given a Personal Prelature (*to bring it under modernists*).

COMMENT: In other words the Roman trap will be lined with cushions. What a series of illusions! Poor SSPX! Let us pray for the saving of whatever can still be saved of it.

Kyrie eleison.



# BISHOPS' DECLARATION – I

No. CDLVIII (458)

*April 23, 2016*

We have a third Resistance bishop now.  
A Declaration told the why and how.

On March 19 a little over one month ago Dom Thomas Aquinas was quietly consecrated bishop for the benefit of souls all over the world wishing to keep the true Catholic faith. As when Bishop Faure was consecrated just one year before, the ceremony was beautifully organised by the monks of the Monastery of the Holy Cross in the mountains behind Rio de Janeiro, in the Monastery's steel barn cathedral, handsomely decorated for the occasion as last year. The weather was dry and warm without being too warm. St Joseph made everything run smoothly. We owe him great thanks.

There were slightly more people attending than last year, but more of them were from nearby in Brazil. There were no journalists present and the event passed with barely a mention even in Traditional Catholic news sources. Was there a conspiracy of silence? Had a word gone out to pay no attention? It does not matter. What does matter is what Almighty God may be suggesting, namely the survival of the Faith is not right now calling for publicity or for making oneself known but rather perhaps for sliding into the shadows, from which the Church can gently lower itself into the catacombs to wait for its resurrection after the storm in the world, which promises to be humanly terrible, has played itself out.

In any case we have now another bishop, firmly in the line of Archbishop Lefebvre, and on the western side of the Atlantic. Like Bishop Faure he knew the Archbishop well and was a confidant of his. Bishop Thomas Aquinas never worked with the Archbishop directly from within the SSPX, but because he was not a member of the Society, the Archbishop may have felt that much more free to share his thoughts and ideas with him. Certainly he gave to the young monk invaluable advice on more than one occasion, which Bishop Thomas has never forgotten. Believing Catholics are not mistaken – there have been few exceptions to their overwhelmingly positive reaction to God's gift of another true shepherd of souls.

At the time of the consecration the two consecrating bishops made a Declaration which has not yet had much publicity. It gives the in-depth background of the consecration, showing how such an apparently strange event is not really strange at all, but quite natural in the circumstances. Here is the first part of the Declaration. The second part will have to follow in next week's "Eleison Comments."

*Our Lord Jesus Christ having warned us that at his Second Coming the faith will almost have disappeared from the face of the earth (Lk. XVIII, 8), it follows that from the Church's triumph in the Middle Ages onwards it could only experience a long decline down to the end of the world. Three upheavals in particular marked out stages of this decline: Protestantism refusing the Church in the 16th century; Liberalism refusing Jesus Christ in the 18th century; and Communism refusing God altogether in the 20th century.*

*Worst of all, however, was when this Revolution by stages managed to penetrate inside the Church, thanks to the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965). Wishing to bring the Church back in contact with the modern world that had moved so far away from it, Paul VI succeeded in getting the Council Fathers to adopt "the values of 200 years of liberal culture" (Cardinal Ratzinger).*

*What the Fathers adopted was the triple ideal of the French Revolution in particular: liberty, equality and fraternity, in the triple form of religious liberty whose emphasis on human dignity implied lifting man above God; collegiality whose promotion of democracy undermined and levelled down all authority within the Church; and ecumenism whose praise of false religions implied the denial of the divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ. And in the half-century following Vatican II the deadly consequences for the Church of adopting the Revolutionary "values" have become only more and more obvious, culminating in the appalling scandals disgracing almost day by day the pontificate of the reigning Pope.*

Kyrie eleison.

## BISHOPS' DECLARATION – II

No. CDLIX (459)

April 30, 2016

A truly devilish disorientation  
Called for another bishop's consecration.

Here is the second and last part of the bishops' Declaration at Bishop Thomas Aquinas' consecration in Brazil on March 19, six weeks ago:—

*Yet the gravest of all in our 21st century is perhaps the mass of Catholics, both clergy and laity, who are still docilely following the destroyers. As to the churchmen, how can the destroyers amongst them not be aware of what they are doing? It must be by that "diabolical disorientation" mentioned even before the Council by Sister Lucy of Fatima. And as for the laity, how can so many still not see that Catholic Authority only exists to establish Catholic Truth, and once it betrays that Truth it loses its right to be obeyed? It must be by the same "disorientation." So in what exactly does this disorientation consist? In the loss of Truth, in the progressive loss of all sense of the very existence of objective truth, because men have wanted to break free from the reality of God and his creatures and to replace that reality with their own fantasy, so as to be able to do as they like. It is always false freedom at work.*

*But God does not abandon his Church, and so in the 1970's he raised up Archbishop Lefebvre to come to its help. The Archbishop recognized that the Pope and his kindred spirits at the Council were for the sake of being modern leaving behind the Church's Tradition, and that by so doing they would destroy the Church. By a sort of miracle he managed to set up within the Church a solid resistance to the on-going destruction, in the form of a Priestly Fraternity which he dedicated to St Pius X, a Pope who saw right through the corruption of modern times. But the Roman authorities would not put up with anyone refusing their supposed "renewal" of Vatican II, so they did everything within their power to make the Archbishop's resistance disappear.*

*However he stood up to them, and in order to guarantee that his work of immense importance for the defence of Catholic Tradition would survive, in 1988 he proceeded to consecrate four bishops, against the express will of the mistaken Roman authorities, but in line with the implicit will of all Popes since the beginning of the Church, with the exception of the last four, all won over to the Council.*

*This heroic decision by by Archbishop Lefebvre was amply justified by events, notably the uninterrupted downfall of the Church authorities whose only wish was to bring the Church in line with today's corrupt world. Of these four bishops, the Spanish-speaker was appointed to settle in South America to look after Catholics wishing to keep the Faith of all time in a whole continent, formerly so Catholic, but where there were now no more bishops that could be relied on to lead souls to Heaven.*

*Alas, the downfall has gone on ever since, only now it is the Archbishop's Society of St Pius X that is in turn falling victim to the universal corruption by its General Chapter of 2012, where the Society's leaders under their Superior General made the Society lurch towards the Council. Instead of insisting on the primacy of the Church's unchanging doctrine, on Tradition, they opened the door to an agreement with official Rome, given over to the Council. And so since 2012, the same disorientation has been making its way within the Society, whose bishops can at least for the moment no longer be relied on. That is most sad, but altogether normal in the present state of Church and world. Hence once more, a reliable bishop needs to be consecrated to make sure that the unchanging Faith survives, especially where a whole continent of souls needs a true shepherd to save their souls for eternity.*

*May God be with him! Let us pray to the Blessed Virgin Mary that she keep him faithful under her mantle, faithful unto death.*

Bishop Jean-Michel Faure.  
Bishop Richard Williamson.

# BENEDICT'S FEELINGS

No. CDLX (460)

May 7, 2016

When Benedict makes Redemption all so nice,  
Then Christ becomes no more than sugar and spice.

When two months ago an interview given in October of last year by Benedict XVI to a Jesuit priest was published in Italy, some misguidedly “pious” Catholics took it to mean that the former Pope was returning to Traditional doctrine on the absolute need to belong to the Catholic Church for salvation. Alas, the interview shows in reality an unrepentant modernist measuring not modern man by Catholic Truth, but that Truth by what modern man can or cannot understand and accept. In fairness, the interviewer raised four serious questions, and Benedict did not dodge them. Here is another cruelly brief but not essentially unjust summary of the interview, with comments added in italics:—

Q: Does FAITH come through a community, which is in turn a gift of God?

A: Faith is a personal living contact with God, mediated through a living community, because in order to believe I need witnesses to God, i.e. the Church, which is not just a set of ideas (*true, but a set of ideas is the very object of faith believed in. Benedict shares in modern subjectivism*). Through the Church's sacraments (*in accordance with the Faith's objective parameters*) I enter into living contact with Christ .

Q: Can modern man understand Paul's JUSTIFICATION by FAITH? (*Notice modern man's priority*) A: For modern man, God cannot let most men suffer eternal damnation (*same comment*). The concern for personal salvation has mostly disappeared (*so what? So the doctrine must change?*). But modern man still perceives his own need of mercy, so he does know his own unworthiness. In fact he expects a saving love, which is God's mercy, which justifies him (*so man sins, expects God's mercy, and that justifies him? This is sheer Protestantism!*). On the contrary the classic idea of God the Father killing his own Son to satisfy his own justice is incomprehensible today. Rather, the Father and the Son had the same will (*but Jesus as God and man had two wills!*), and the mass of the world's evil was overcome as it needed to be by God's sharing in the world's suffering, in which Father and Son shared alike (*but the Father as God could not*

*suffer, and only as man could Christ suffer! This new doctrine empties out the Incarnation, the Cross, mankind's sin, God's justice, our Redemption! What is left of Catholicism?).*

Q: Has the Church's teaching on HELL evolved in modern times?

A: "On this point we are faced with a profound evolution of dogma" (*sic! But dogma cannot evolve. As a modern man, Benedict has no notion of a truth unchanging and unchangeable*). "After Vatican II, the conviction that the unbaptised are forever lost was finally abandoned" (*as though Vatican II could change Church teaching!*). But then arises a problem – why still be a Christian (*good question!*)? Rahner's solution of all men being anonymous Christians leaves out the drama of conversion (*only "drama" – not "absolute necessity"?*). The Pluralists' solution whereby all religions suffice for salvation is inadequate (*true*). De Lubac's solution is that Christ and the Church somehow stand in for all mankind, let us say by believing in, practising and suffering for the truth. At least a few souls are needed to do so.

Q: If evil must be repaired, does the sacrament of CONFESSION repair it?

A: Christ alone can repair evil, but Confession does always put us back on the side of Christ.

In view of such an interview, can any one still doubt that the Society of St Pius X leaders are seriously deluded who think the Society can safely put itself under these Romans? From humanism and Protestantism a false view of the Redemption has soaked into modern bones, and from modern bones finally into the Catholic churchmen. Vatican II teaches and preaches a Christianity without the Cross. It is highly popular, but utterly false. May God have mercy on these churchmen.

Kyrie eleison.

# CHRISTIAN FEELINGS

No. CDLXI (461)

May 14, 2016

Christ showed that suffering is a precious gift.  
For downcast souls, here is their God-given lift.

How can it even have occurred to Pope Benedict that God the Father was cruel to God the Son by making him pay for the sins of the world (cf. EC of last week)? “I have a baptism wherewith I am to be baptised,” says the Son himself, “and how am I straitened until it be accomplished” (Lk. XII, 50). St Theresa of Avila wanted “to suffer or die,” but St. Mary Magdalene de Pazzi wanted “to suffer and not to die.” The following quote may present that Christian understanding of suffering which is lacking to modern Benedict:—

*Who can I tell what I am suffering? Nobody on this earth, because it is not a suffering of this earth and nobody on earth would understand. The suffering is a sweet kind of pain and a painful kind of sweetness. I wish I could suffer ten times, a hundred times more. For nothing in the world would I want it to stop. Yet that does not mean I am not suffering. I suffer as though I were gripped by the throat, clamped in the jaws of a vice, being burnt in a furnace, pierced to the very heart.*

*Were I allowed to move, to be on my own, so that I could jump and sing to let loose what I am feeling inside, because the pain is truly felt, it would be a relief. But I am pinned like Jesus on the Cross. I can neither move, nor be on my own, and I have to bite my tongue in order not to satisfy people's curiosity with my sweet agony. To bite my tongue is putting it mildly. Only with a great effort can I control the impulse to let out the cry of supernatural pain and joy which wells up within and wants to burst out with all the force of a blazing flame or gushing water.*

*The face of Jesus, clouded over with pain as Pilate shows him to the crowd, attracts me like the spectacle of some disaster. He is in front of me and looks at me, standing on the steps of the Pretorium, his head crowned with thorns, his hands tied in front of the idiot's dress given him by Herod to ridicule him, but in fact clothing him in a whiteness that befits his perfect Innocence. He says nothing, but everything in him is speaking, calling to me, asking me for something.*

*For what? He is asking me to love him. I know that that is it, and I give it to him until I feel I am dying with a sword piercing through my chest. But he is still asking me for something that I do not understand. And I wish I understood. Not understanding is torture for me. I wish I could give him everything he wants, even if I had to undergo an agonising death. And still I cannot give it to him.*

*His face, filled with pain, attracts me and fascinates me. He is beautiful enough when he is the Master or when he is Risen from the dead. But seeing him then fills me merely with joy, whereas seeing him in pain fills me with an unfathomable love, unmatched even by a mother's care for her suffering creature.*

*Yes, I do understand. Compassionate love is the crucifixion of the creature that follows its Master all the way to the final torment. It is a tyrannical love, blocking out all thought of anything other than his pain. We no longer belong to ourselves. We live only to console his torture, and his torture is our torment which literally kills us. And yet every tear torn out of us by the pain is dearer than a pearl of great price, and every pain of his we can enter into is more sought after than any treasure.*

*Father, I have tried to tell you what I am going through, but I try in vain. Amongst all the visions that God has given me it will always be the sight of his suffering that will lift my soul to the seventh heaven. To die of love while gazing on his suffering – what death could be more beautiful?*

Kyrie eleison.



# DOCTRINAL FEELINGS

No. CDLXII (462)

May 21, 2016

Thank God for women willing for Christ to suffer.  
To shield us from his wrath they are his buffer.

Last week's "Comments" (EC 461) will not have been to everyone's taste. Readers may have guessed that the unnamed author of the long quote was of the same sex as the also quoted St Theresa of Avila ("suffer, or die") and St Mary Magdalene de Pazzi ("suffer and not die"), and the anonymous quote may have seemed excessively emotional. But the contrast with Pope Benedict's feelings quoted the week before (EC 460) was deliberate. Whereas the man's text showed feelings governing doctrine, the woman's text showed doctrine governing feelings. Better, obviously, the woman putting God first, like Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane (*"Father, let this chalice pass me by, but not my will . . ."*), than the man putting feelings first, and changing the Catholic doctrine and religion into the Conciliar religion.

The surprising contrast highlights that the primacy of God means that doctrine comes first, whereas the primacy of feelings means that man comes first. But life is not about avoiding suffering, it is about getting to Heaven. If then I disbelieve in God and worship Mammon instead (Mt. VI, 24), I will disbelieve in any after-life and I will pay for more and more expensive drugs to avoid suffering in this life, because there is no other life. And so the Western "democracies" create one ruinous welfare State after another, because the surest way for a "democratic" politician to get elected or not is to take a stand for or against free medicine. Care for the body is all that is left in the life of many a man who has no God. Thus godlessness ruins the State: "Unless the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Ps. CXXVI, 1), whereas "Happy is that people whose God is the Lord" (Ps. CXLIII, 15). Religion governs politics and economics alike, any false religion for their ill, the true religion for their true good.

On the basis of his October interview (EC 460), Benedict might reply: "Yes, but what use is a religion that fewer and fewer people believe in? On modern man the Catholic religion of all time has lost its grip. Yesterday's doctrine may be as true as true can be, but of what use is it if it no longer speaks to man as he is today, where he is today?"

Doctrine is for souls, but how can I speak to contemporary man of redemptive suffering or of the Redemption, when suffering makes no sense to him at all? The Council was absolutely necessary to recast doctrine in a form intelligible to men as they are today.”

And to this position implicit in Benedict’s interview, here might be an answer: “Your Holiness, doctrine is for souls, yes, but to save them from eternal punishment and not to prepare them for it. Doctrine consists of words, words express concepts, concepts are ultimately of things real being conceived. Your Holiness, are God, man’s immortal soul, death, Judgment, and the inevitability of eternal salvation or damnation realities outside my mind? If they are realities independent of myself, have any of them changed since modern times? And if they have not changed at all, then do not the doctrines expressing them express also, together with the doctrine of original sin, a real danger for every man alive of falling into Hell? In which case however unpleasant the realities may feel, what possible service do I do for my fellow-men by making the doctrines feel nicer, so as to disguise the eternal danger instead of warning him about it? Of what importance are his feelings compared with the importance of his grasping, and assimilating, the true doctrines, so as to be blissfully happy and not utterly tormented for all eternity – for all eternity?

But in our apostate world the mass of men want only to be told fables (II Tim. IV, 4) to put a cushion under their sins. The result is that to keep the moral world in balance, there must be a number of mystic souls, known to God alone, who are taking upon themselves acute suffering, for Christ and for their fellow-men, and it is a fair bet that most of them are women.

Kyrie eleison.

# “NORMALISATION” ILLUSIONS

No. CDLXIII (463)

May 28, 2016

Between the Society and Rome a great gulf lies  
In which all reconciliation dies.

Let all SSPX Superiors taking part in their upcoming meeting to consider Rome's latest offer towards reconciliation ponder well Fr Girouard's comments on Fr Schmidberger's recent statement (see EC 457):—

*A) In paragraph IV, Fr. Schmidberger says that Abp Lefebvre was seeking recognition even after the 1988 consecrations. He fails to mention that the Archbishop laid down conditions: a total return by Rome to the anti-liberal and anti-modernist documents of Traditional Popes. The same paragraph states that the SSPX did not seek a rapprochement with Rome. That Rome started it in 2000. Fr. S. fails to mention that the GREC meetings, seeking to “normalize” the Society, started in 1997, with the blessing of Bishop Fellay.*

*B) In paragraph V, the letter states that Rome has greatly lowered her conditions for a normalization, and that it is therefore the right time for us to accept. Fr. S. fails to understand that the lowering of the demands by Rome is because: 1-The SSPX has already been re-branded and is therefore more agreeable to Rome; 2-Rome knows that more liberalization of the SSPX will happen naturally after the normalization.*

*C) In paragraph VI (Answers to objections) # 3, Fr. S. says the SSPX will not keep silent after the normalization. But in fact, they already are doing so! And they have been for years! The SSPX reactions to Assisi 3, to the World Youth Days, to the “canonizations/beatifications” of Popes J.XXIII, JPII, and Paul VI, to the Synods on the Family and the latest encyclical of Pope Francis (Amoris Laetitia), and other scandals, have been nothing more than subdued and soft “slaps on the wrist.” So it will be worse after the normalization, as the SSPX will fear to lose what it will have taken such pains to acquire.*

*D) In Par. VI, #4, Fr. S. says we have to make ourselves as useful as possible to the Church, which means the SSPX needs to be normalised, to make the Church better by the SSPX being inside. My answer to this is the same as above in B and C: Once absorbed into the official modernist structure, the SSPX, which has already lost its “saltiness,” will be overwhelmed by*

*bad influences, and its message and actions will have steadily less effect.*

*E) In Par. VI, # 5, Fr. S. says that the whole point of the situation is: "Who will convert whom?" And that we need to be strong, and we will be the ones converting the modernists once we are inside. This is the same kind of reasoning as somebody who would rent a room in a brothel in order to convert the prostitutes and their clients! It is a sin of presumption.*

*F) In Par. VI, #6, Fr. S. says that we are not facing the same problems and temptations as the other Traditional communities who have rallied to Rome and then betrayed the fight, because often with guilt these communities started the process, whereas in the case of SSPX, it is Rome that started it in 2000. My answer to this is like in A: GREC started the process in 1997, with the blessing of Bishop Fellay.*

*G) In Par. VII (Conclusion), Fr. S says that we must not fear, because the Society has been consecrated to the BVM, and She will protect us. He fails to mention so many Congregations and persons consecrated to Her who have perished since Vatican II! Just think of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, the Servites of Mary, and so forth and so on! The BVM is never going to help those who put themselves voluntarily into an occasion of sin and destruction! To believe the contrary is to mock Her and to mock God! Once again, a sin of presumption! This is not the best way, to say the least, to work at the conversion of Rome and the re-building of the Church!*

*All that will be left to say, once the Society is "normalised," is: RIP SSPX, and God have mercy on us!*

Kyrie eleison.

# CHURCH ABANDONED?

No. CDLXIV (464)

June 4, 2016

In circumstances of wholesale despair  
The Psalmist teaches, trust in God, and prayer.

As day by day the chaos increases in almost everything and everybody around us, and inside the Church it seems as though everybody is against everybody, it is certainly reassuring to find that the Psalmist of maybe 3,000 years ago cried out to God to come to the aid of his people, in similar distress from his enemies. Then as now they rose up in their pride against him, their pride “ascends continually,” they have done their best to wreck his Temple and his religion, and he has allowed them much success. Here is Psalm 73 (74), with minimal notes of explanation in italics:—

A. How can God be allowing the triumph of His enemies against His own Church?

[1] O God, why hast Thou cast us off unto the end: why is Thy wrath enkindled against the sheep of Thy pasture? [2] Remember Thy congregation ( *Catholic Church* ), which Thou hast possessed from the beginning. The sceptre of Thy inheritance which Thou hast redeemed: Mount Sion ( *Catholic Church* ) in which Thou hast dwelt. [3] Lift up Thy hands against their ( *God's enemies* ) pride unto the end; see what things the enemy hath done wickedly in the sanctuary. [4] And they that hate Thee have made their boasts, in the midst of Thy solemnity. They have set up their ensigns for signs, [5] and they knew not ( *the holiness of God* ) both in the going out and on the highest top ( *Temple gates and summit* ). As with axes in a wood of trees, [6] they have cut down at once the gates thereof, with axe and hatchet ( *Vatican II* ) they have brought it down. [7] They have set fire to Thy sanctuary: they have defiled the dwelling place of Thy name ( *Catholic Church* ) on the earth. [8] They said in their heart, the whole kindred of them together: Let us abolish all the festival days of God ( *Catholic liturgy* ) from the land. [9] Our signs we have not seen, there is now no prophet: and He will know us no more ( *God has given up. We are on our own.* ) [10] How long, O God, shall the enemy reproach: is the adversary to provoke thy name for ever? [11] Why dost thou turn away Thy hand: and Thy right hand out of the midst of thy bosom for ever?

B. But God is the Master of salvation, of history and of all Nature. [12] But God is

our king before ages: he hath wrought salvation in the midst of the earth. [13] Thou by Thy strength didst make the sea (*Red Sea crossing*) firm: Thou didst crush the heads of the dragons (*Egyptians*) in the waters. [14] Thou hast broken the heads of the dragon (*Egyptian king*): thou hast given him to be meat for the people of the Ethiopians. [15] Thou hast broken up the fountains and the torrents: Thou hast dried up the Ethan (*running strongly, e.g. Jos. III*) rivers. [16] Thine is the day, and Thine is the night: Thou hast made the morning light and the sun. [17] Thou hast made all the borders of the earth: the summer and the spring were formed by Thee.

C. O God, forget not your own humble people, and crush your proud enemies. [18] Remember this, the enemy hath reproached the Lord: and a foolish people hath provoked Thy name. [19] Deliver not up to beasts the souls that confess to Thee: and forget not to the end the souls of Thy poor. [20] Have regard to Thy covenant (*New Testament*): for they that are the obscure of the earth have been filled with dwellings of iniquity. [21] Let not the humble be turned away with confusion: the poor and needy shall praise Thy name. [22] Arise, O God, judge thy own cause: remember Thy reproaches with which the foolish man hath reproached Thee all the day. [23] Forget not the voices of Thy enemies: the pride of them that hate Thee ascendeth continually.

Kyrie eleison.

# ARCHBISHOP'S AIM

No. CDLXV (465)

*June 11, 2016*

Who puts the Archbishop's work under this Rome  
Betrays the Faith and him, and Catholics' home.

In this fateful month for the Society of St Pius X, June 2016, when we hear that some 30 Superiors will meet in order to decide whether to accept Rome's latest offer of official recognition, it is surely a good moment to correct misunderstandings as to the intentions of its Founder, Archbishop Lefebvre (1905–1991). Some claim that his course was unsteady, that he “zig-zagged,” veering from side to side. Others pretend that above all he sought Rome's recognition for his Society. Without having to claim that he was infallible one needs to remind the forgetful Society of what he was all about: both errors are corrected by the same observation, namely that his basic motivation was to glorify God and to save souls by serving God's one true Church by defending the Faith, and to defend the Faith by founding the Society of St Pius X to form priests who would preserve the doctrine, sacraments and Mass of Catholic Tradition.

Now the great obstacle in the Archbishop's way was the churchmen of Vatican II whose main priority was (and remains) to please not God but modern man, who has moved far away from God. So, now as then, they turned away from God (at least objectively, subjectively God knows), and sought to change God's Church and her Faith, doctrine, sacraments and Mass by a humanistic “renewal.”

In disgust or despair the Archbishop might have taken himself off into a corner with his Society, and left these churchmen to perish with their Conciliar Revolution. But firstly, from the 1974 Roman visitation of Écône onwards, they came after him with his work because they could not let it demonstrate their perversity. They could not afford to leave him alone. And secondly, if he could do anything to bring Tradition to the Romans and the Romans back to Tradition, it would benefit through them the worldwide Church and not just his little Society. For indeed, however misguided they were, they still occupied “the seat of Moses” (cf. Mt XXIII, 2), and so from 1975 onwards the Archbishop went to and from Rome, until their prevarication in 1988

over granting another bishop to the Society proved once and for all that they could no longer be spoken to with words but only with actions.

But “Stat Crux dum Volvitur Orbis,” meaning that the Cross stands still while the whole world is in revolution. Anchored in Tradition, the Archbishop was basically standing still, but he was dealing with churchmen and a situation of the Church which had slipped that anchor and was henceforth adrift. So as they drifted left, so he needed to steer right, whereas if they seemed to veer right again (as in late 1987 and early 1988) so he veered left (e.g. in the Protocol of May 5, 1988), but it was always their veering or the evolving situation (e.g. the deteriorating Novus Ordo Mass) that determined his “zig-zagging,” and not the other way round. His own aim was steady – the defence of the Faith.

It was for this same reason that, once the churchmen’s prevarication on that same 5th of May in 1988 was clear beyond any reasonable doubt, then after a night’s reflection he renounced on May 6th that Protocol which could have obtained Rome’s official recognition for the Society, and he cut off all merely diplomatic relations with Rome, not primarily to save his Society but to protect Catholic Tradition for the entire Church. Doctrine had to take over from diplomacy, and from then on until his death two and a half years later, even while behaving with respect towards the Church officials whom he had castigated as “antichrists,” he declared that the Faith had to come first in the form of the pre-Conciliar Popes’ anti-liberal and anti-modern doctrinal Encyclicals. By his fidelity to Church doctrine he was in the driving-seat, and the Romans knew it. What a contrast with his successors at the head of the Society, fawning on the betrayers of Church doctrine and Tradition, and humiliated by them! Let these successors of the Archbishop just read again what was like his farewell address to them of September 6, 1990.

Kyrie eleison.



## “ANTI-SEMITISM” TRICKERY

No. CDLXVI (466)

June 18, 2016

Is “antisemite” wielded like a sword?  
Just ask the wielder to define the word.

There are treacherous words which seem to mean one thing and are used to mean quite another. One of the most treacherous words of all is “anti-semitism.” The word seems to mean opposition to all Jews purely and simply because they are Jews, and in this sense it rightly condemns something bad, because some Jews are wicked, but certainly not all. On the other hand it is often used to condemn absolutely any opposition to anything that any Jews do, and then the word is wrongly condemning something good, because whenever Jews do anything bad then opposition to them is good. But do Jews do things bad? Obviously. They created Islam for Arabs, Freemasonry for Gentiles and Communism for the modern world, all three primarily to fight Jesus Christ and Christianity, and so send souls to Hell.

A book which all Catholics should read who wish to defend the Church against Islam, Freemasonry and Communism, now Globalism, is *The Plot Against the Church* by Maurice Pinay. The book was written just before Vatican II to be put into the hands of all Council Fathers, to warn them of the great danger in which the Church would find herself at the Council. Sure enough. The Council Fathers ended up praising Islam (*Unitatis Redintegratio*), adopting Freemasonic principles (*Dignitatis Humanae*) and never mentioning, still less condemning, the evil system of Communism. Here is how in his Chapter on “Antisemitism and Christianity” Maurice Pinay analyses the treachery of the word “antisemitism”:—

Down the ages the Jews have always used vague words with a variety of meanings, writes Pinay, to snare Gentile minds and so prevent them from defending themselves against the Jewish drive towards world domination in that 2,000-year war on Christianity which he carefully documents throughout his book. So in a first stage, by three arguments they seek to prevail upon Gentile leaders to condemn “antisemitism” in its first sense, given above, of opposition to everything and everybody Jewish: firstly, Christ, by establishing the equality of all men before God, condemned any such

degrading of a whole race; secondly, Christ told all men to “love one another”; thirdly, Christ and his Mother were both Jewish.

But in a second stage the Jews, having once obtained the Gentiles’ condemnation of a vague “antisemitism,” then proceed to give the word a quite different meaning, the second sense above, of any and all opposition to anything whatsoever that Jews do. Thus “antisemites” become: all patriots exerting their right of self-defence against Jewish subversion of their country; all defenders of the family against the errors and vices of all sorts fomented by the Jews to dissolve it (e.g. abortion, pornography); all Catholics defending their holy religion against every form of corruption being openly or secretly promoted by the Jews to undermine it; all truth-tellers unmasking Jews as the originators of Freemasonry and Communism (now of Globalism and feminism, etc.); and all people in general opposing Jewish subversion of the Church and of Christian civilisation. And by their control of politics, finance, films and above all by their media, the Jews have succeeded in giving such an electric charge to this one little word “anti-semite,” that it is enough to electrocute anyone that it touches.

But who is foolish enough to have allowed them to control politics and finance? Who has allowed them to virtually monopolise the film industry and the media? Who thinks it is so smart to have done away with all censorship and is now co-operating with them to enable them to censor the Internet? Gentile liberals in every case, who are therefore being enslaved, by the minute, in their New World Order. Doctor, cure thyself! For who that reads their newspapers or watches their television programmes has anybody to blame but himself for letting them take over his mind, and his civilisation?

Catholics, read *The Plot against the Church*. If anybody is accusing you of being an “antisemite,” it is quite possible you have reason to be proud.

Kyrie eleison.

# DERAIL DRIVE

No. CDLXVII (467)

June 25, 2016

The Society is sinking, not yet sunk.  
Pray for its leaders reeling, as though drunk.

A number of Catholics who love the Church and understand what the Society of St Pius X could and should be doing for it, were encouraged by recent words of one of its bishops. They thought that maybe yet it can be pulled back from the brink of an agreement by which it would put itself under the control of some of the Church's (objectively) worst enemies in all its history – the neo-modernist officials of today's Rome. Indeed there were many good things said by Bishop de Galarreta in his Ordinations sermon on June 3 at the last priestly Ordinations to be held in Winona, Minnesota, before its move to Virginia, but no friend of the Catholic Faith should raise his hopes too high.

His sermon began by connecting the Catholic priesthood to Our Lord Jesus Christ as the one and only Way, Truth and Life. But, he went on, there is today in the Church a relativism in doctrine which opens the door to relativism in morals and to such scandals as the recent Roman Synod's even just considering the giving of Holy Communion to couples divorced and "remarried." The bishop said these scandals were rooted in Vatican II, and he castigated the Council as being a bad tree of which they are merely the logical bad fruit. Now Mgr Pozzo raised hopes several weeks ago that the Society in order to obtain official recognition from Rome might not have to accept the Council, but the Bishop rightly pointed out that both Pope Francis and Cardinal Mueller have since dashed such hopes, by making clear that their recognition of the Society will still require that acceptance.

The Bishop concluded, "*Therefore it is also clear that the (Society's) fight continues. As our Superior General, Bishop Fellay, has said, if we have to choose between faith and a compromise, the choice is already made – no compromise.*" Fighting words, but the Bishop immediately added a possible escape-hatch of a kind familiar to us from him: "*God may certainly change the circumstances and put us in a different situation, which is what we all hope for.*" For could not "changed circumstances" include some clever understanding

agreeable to both Rome and the Superior General, which the latter would accept? (Nor was it any use Bishop de Galarreta's quoting just beforehand words of the Superior General against his own policy, because his own words do not normally pin down this Superior General.)

What strongly suggests that the fighting words do not in fact correspond to the Superior General's own intentions is the speed with which the text including them was taken down (to be doctored or trashed?) so soon after it was put up on the official website of the Society in the USA. What lesser official of the Society could have given the order virtually to disown words of one of its own bishops? Such an idea is rather confirmed by a conference given on June 5 by the Society's second-in-command to parishioners of the Society's church in Houston, TX, and not since disowned by Headquarters (comments in italics):—

Fr Pfluger said that there is nothing wrong in going with Rome (*illusion*); that the Society will go as it is (*illusion*): that we must move with the times, and now is the time to be in Rome (*illusion*); that Archbishop Lefebvre also contradicted himself many times in his time (*illusion* – see June 11's "*Eleison Comments*"), and finally that here and now we must trust Bishop Fellay (*after all his "terminological inexactitudes"?* – *illusion!*). But the Society's First Assistant is more than free to say such things, because they are faithful to the Society's drive at the very top to put itself under Roman control.

In conclusion, dear readers, for the sake of all the good that the true Society could and should be doing for the Universal Church, by all means pray for a miracle to derail that drive towards Rome, and put any pressure you can on Superiors taking part in the end of June meeting (not yet a General Chapter, but preparing the fatal one) that they make themselves the instruments of God in the derailing of that drive.

Kyrie eleison.

# COUNTRY ADVANTAGES

No. CDLXVIII (468)

July 2, 2016

Cities and suburbs do do harm to man,  
But pray to Almighty God he always can.

Since no human being was ever created by God on this earth for any other reason than to go to Heaven (I Tim. II, 4), then the goodness of God is at work all the time, in one form or another, more or less strongly, to attract all souls towards Heaven. And if a man begins to respond to that attraction, he is bound to realize sooner or later that the mass of souls surrounding him today are either unaware of that attraction or are positively resisting it. And the more serious he may become about getting to Heaven himself, the more seriously he must wonder what are the factors in the world around him which make so many souls careless of Heaven, or at least of getting there.

Some of these factors may be immediately apparent to him, like the recent advance of unnatural vice and its triumph in the worldwide legalisation of same-sex “marriage.” Other factors he may need rather more time to appreciate because they are not so obviously opposed to virtue and because they soaked into the environment much longer ago, like living in cities or sub-cities, i.e., suburbs. Now only a fool would claim that every country-dweller is full of virtue while every city-dweller is full of vice. On the other hand country living is obviously closer to Nature than is city living, so that if Nature was created by God to be the indispensable carrier of that Supernature without which no soul can enter Heaven, then country-dwellers will, as such, be closer to God than city-dwellers, and a city-dweller wishing to get to Heaven must at least take stock of the fabric of his life in the city.

“Learn from your enemy,” said the Latins. Communism is one of the most terrible enemies ever of Catholicism, and two outstanding Communists are famous for their hatred of country-dwellers, or peasants. For Lenin (1870–1924), leader of the Russian Revolution in 1917, a major obstacle in the way of the godless Revolution was the old-fashioned peasant, rooted in the earth, profoundly aware of his nothingness as a creature surrounded by the mystery of Creation on which he depended, whereas the city-dweller living in an artificial and man-made world of factories, machines, and

human robots, a world laden with various kinds of resentment (raging against the rain is an exercise in futility while “road rage” is growing all the time), was wholly apt for Revolution (here is why de Corte says modern politicians are constantly promising “change”).

For Antonio Gramsci (1860–1937), master of the Revolution’s key transition after Lenin and Stalin from “hard” Communism to “soft” Globalism, the peasantry represented likewise a redoubtable enemy which the Revolution had to overcome. With its “common sense” and its “natural order” the peasantry had been the foundation of a whole system of values that had to go. Religion, family, homeland, army, nature, culture, had to give way to a whole new way of thinking in accordance with a New World Order. To shift men away from their old mentality, their total culture was to be subverted no more by a violent assault upon their economics, but by a “march through the institutions,” all their institutions. The Revolution would remould their education, arts, entertainment, news, sports, etc., every feature of their culture in the broadest sense, to undermine the total way of life previously embodied in the peasantry. And Gramsci’s Revolution has so succeeded in overthrowing the old natural order that the farmers now working the land are so dependent on machines and the bankers that they are hardly peasants in the old sense any more.

But the Revolution today is such outright war on “everything that calls itself God” that there is no possible human way of reconstructing any peasantry to stand up to it. The best possible peasantry, merely as such, is not the solution. The problem is not merely cultural. The real problem is our apostasy from God. The real solution starts with prayer, which the seemingly almighty Revolution is nevertheless powerless to stop.

Kyrie eleison.

## BREXIT – REALLY?

No. CDLXIX (469)

July 9, 2016

Brexit reminds us once again –  
To build without God is to build in vain.

Many readers of these “Comments” must be supposing that as an Englishman who does not at all like the New World Order, I must be rejoicing over the recent vote by the British people, albeit by a relatively narrow margin, to leave the communistic European Union. Alas, I have to admit that all I have ever learnt over the last tens of years about that NWO makes me doubt that the apparent exit of Britain will amount finally to any real re-affirmation of what was once best in Great Britain. Across the Atlantic likewise, I may love Trump and hate Hilary, but surely the two have been put together to make up for us one Punch and Judy show.

Take for instance, concerning Brexit, the June 24 article of a high-grade American truth-teller, Paul Craig Roberts (see [paulcraigroberts.org](http://paulcraigroberts.org)) on why “Despite the vote, the Odds are Against Britain leaving the EU.” He writes: “The British people should not be so naïve as to think that the vote settles the matter. The fight has only begun.” He warns the British people to expect: their government to come back to them and say, the EU is giving us a better deal so let’s stay in; the Fed, ECB, BOJ and NY hedge funds to hammer the pound sterling as proof that the Brexit vote is sinking Britain’s economy (that hammering has already happened); the Brexit vote to be presented as having weakened Europe in front of “Russian aggression” (which is a sheer NWO fabrication); leading Brexiters to come under pressure to reach a compromise with the EU; etc., etc. And Roberts says readers can imagine for themselves many more such probabilities, reminding them how Ireland voted against Europe years ago until it was pressured to vote for.

However, at <http://henrymakow.com/2016/06/brexit-what-is-the-globalist-game.html>, in my opinion another article goes deeper still, because Henry Makow goes further behind the Punch and Judy show, because he has the advantage of being what the globalists no doubt call an “anti-semite,” or rather a “Jew-hater” because Makow is himself a Jew. Truly, only those with some handle on the Messiah, or the Christ, can take the

measure of the Antichrist.

The article's thesis is that "Brexiters lamented how the Establishment was ranged against them, but in truth the reverse was the reality." To prove this thesis the article names by name numerous British politicians, both Tory and Labour, who are more or less fervent globalists and who campaigned for Brexit (it should be easy enough to check the names for anyone who wishes). Similarly in the British media, the article names numerous journals and journalists, normally presstituted for globalism, who campaigned for Brexit. Then what was Brexit for? The article credits Putin with getting much closer to the truth when he suggested that it was to "blackmail" Europe into making better terms with Britain. The article goes further: Brexit was designed to force Europe to "surrender completely to Anglo-American Zionist war-mongers and corporate privateers," and the article concludes that Brexit was "most certainly no triumph against globalism." And Makow himself adds: "Evidently the powers-that-be have decided that England outside Europe rather than inside can be a more effective instrument of Masonic central bank world tyranny."

Maybe such speculations (but not their level) are off the mark, but for sure and certain, what are either Europe or Britain worth without God? To build without him is to build in vain, says the Psalmist. Yet who in all the Brexit debate ever even mentions his name? If Brexit is to amount to anything truly positive, it will need a leader with vision. Without God, where will he come from?

Kyrie eleison.



## BREXIT – SPEXIT?

No. CDLXX (470)

July 16, 2016

While Menzingen is by Rome's sirens charmed,  
To keep the Faith, let forewarned be forearmed.

There is such a thing as the “Zeitgeist,” or spirit of the age. A proof might be the parallel that can be drawn between Britain's June 23 vote to renounce the communistic embrace of the European Union, and the SSPX Superiors' meeting from June 25 to 28, with Bishop Fellay's Communiqué of June 29 declaring that the Society was now renouncing the embrace of neo-modernist Rome – “Spexit,” for short. For just as last week's “Comments” suggested that Brexit was admirable but doubtfully efficacious, so one may fear that the June 29 St-Pius-Exit may have reassured many good Catholics that the Society is back on track, whereas within days official Rome and Bishop Fellay were saying that contacts continue . . .

The basis of the parallel is the apostasy characterising the Church's Fifth Age, from 1517 to 2017 (or beyond), by which the peoples of the world have slowly but steadily turned their backs on God to replace him with Man. But their conscience is not at ease in the process. Therefore outwardly they pay homage to the good old order, but inwardly they pine for the freedom from God and for the materialistic benefits of the New World Order. Thus a good old instinct drove the British to vote for independence from Communism, but being nearly all atheistic materialists they are Communists without the name, and so hardly now know what to do with their Brexit. So one may fear that there is more to “Spexit” than meets the eye.

For instance, the excellent Hispanic website “Non Possumus” pointed out that when the Communiqué of June 29 looks forward to a Pope “who favours concretely the return to Holy Tradition” (2+2=4 or 5 ), that is not the same thing as a Pope “who has returned to Tradition” (2+2=4, and exclusively 4). Nor is it reassuring that on July 2 Bishop Fellay called for a fifth Rosary Crusade, foreseen on June 24 as a possibility by Fr Girouard in Western Canada. Recalling how Bishop Fellay presented as two gifts of the Mother of God both in 2007 the dubious liberation of the true rite of Mass by *Summorum Pontificum* and in 2009 the “lifting” of the non-existent

“excommunications,” Fr Girouard fears that a unilateral recognition of the Society by official Rome could likewise be presented as a response of hers to this new Rosary Crusade. Here is how Fr Girouard imagines the recognition being presented by Bishop Fellay:—

*“In the Crusade, we have asked for the protection of the Society. Thanks to the 12 million Rosaries, the BVM has obtained for us, from the Heart of Her Son, this special protection! Yes the Holy Father has signed this document where he recognizes us and promises to give us his personal protection, so that we will be able to continue “as we are.” This new gift from God and the BVM is truly a new means given us by Divine Providence to better continue our work for the extension of the Social Kingdom of Christ! It is also the reparation of a grave injustice! This is truly a sign that Rome has changed for the better! Our venerable founder, Archbishop Lefebvre, would have accepted this providential gift. Indeed, we can be sure that he has united his prayers to those of the BVM to obtain it from Our Lord, and that he is now rejoicing with her in Heaven! In thanksgiving for this wonderful gift of Providence, let us renew officially the consecration of the Society to the Hearts of Jesus and Mary, and let us have a Te Deum sung in all our chapels!”*

In such a vision, adds Fr Girouard, anyone refusing the reunion of the Society with Rome will be made to seem to be resisting God and to be scorning his Mother.

Such fears are for the moment only imaginary. What is certain is that the “Spexit” of June 25 to 28 will in no way have shaken Bishop Fellay’s resolve to steer the Archbishop’s society into the arms of neo-modernist Rome. For him, that is the only way forward, as opposed to “insulting good Romans” and “stagnating” in a resistance that is out of date and no longer relevant to the evolving situation.

Kyrie eleison.

# ACADEMIA DIAGNOSED

No. CDLXXI (471)

*July 23, 2016*

If Academia lacks all rhyme and reason  
That is because churchmen committed treason.

When your Excellency asked me as a student of history whether I agreed with you that the agnostic phenomenism condemned in Pascendi is the greatest single clue-in to the modern scene, I briefly concurred. Then I asked myself how men, especially learned men, could ever take seriously such nonsense as the mind knowing nothing beyond the phenomena, or appearances. And I recalled how, after sitting in University classrooms for the past 3 1/2 years, and listening carefully to some brilliant professors who seem to have a sense of reality, and to many who do not, I myself had begun to wonder why some have a great sense of reason and others with the same or similar Doctorate Degrees have adopted such wild and unreasonable ideas. Let me give you the answer of this long-time observer of the academic scene . . . .

It dawned on me after a little thought that the professors who were the most logical were Catholics, because they may be conservatives at best, but they have a realistic view of the world. The ideas and concepts they teach are, for the most part, sensible. On the other hand, the instructions of a majority of professors are muddled, confusing, and nonsensical. They profess bizarre and outlandish ideas and back them up with half-truths. They adopt almost any trendy notion, such as Global Warming or Climate Change ( the new “Evolution”), and present it as truth. Their reasoning behind these notions is pure nonsense and cannot stand up to close scrutiny. I began to wonder, how can such learned men be so ignorant? After much thought I came up with what I am sure is the true answer.

Since the professors who are more sensible are men at least striving to be Catholic, it would stand to reason that they possess something that the heathens do not. Before the revolt by Martin Luther, most scholars or learned men were Catholics who used their reason and possessed common sense, so that most taught and believed the same truth. When Luther ravaged the Church, he also ravaged many learned clerics and university professors. In particular, his new religion eliminated the Sacrament of

Confirmation by which we know that Catholics receive the seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, four of which are for the mind: Knowledge, Wisdom, Understanding, and Counsel. All four are now lacking to today's agnostic professors. These may be well-educated, learned people, but they cannot use their learning in a reasonable way, or apply it to reality. As Pius X says, they develop fantasies and present them as truths, and furthermore convince themselves that they are brilliant, when in fact they are wallowing in ignorance. They are the  $2+2=5$  cult! And proud of it.

On this theory, today's destruction of academia would go back to Luther's abandoning of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and to Europe's universities becoming less and less Catholic. Eventually thousands of professors were unleashed on the world of academia who were educated beyond their ability to reason. Lacking Wisdom, Understanding, Knowledge, and Counsel in their highest sense as Gifts from God, they developed in universities the panoply of today's errors, or "isms." For instance, to claim that Global Warming will destroy man and the world is sheer nonsense, yet it is taught and believed in modern Universities, as if it were  $2+2 = 4$ . And these poisonous ideas are gobbled up by the wide-eyed youth in Universities, like biscuits at High Tea, especially the idea that Truth is merely what each of us believes it to be, and Reason be damned.

So it would follow that when Vatican II chose to follow in Luther's footsteps by abandoning Tradition and by so "renewing" the sacrament of Confirmation as to threaten its validity, Catholics too imperilled the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and lost correspondingly the ability to reason, because Newchurch Confirmation is now meant simply to make them "better Christians."

Kyrie eleison.

# AUTHENTIC THOMISM

No. CDLXXII (472)

*July 30, 2016*

Truth which is true excludes all contradiction.  
“Truth” which admits of error, is truth-fiction.

The way in which modernism can combine apparent sincerity and good faith with dissolution of the truth is so dangerous for the real faith of Catholics that it can hardly be described or analysed too often. The recent question of a Traditional layman provides another opportunity to do so. He asks whether a priest of the Society of St Pius X is wise who reads regularly a Conciliar Thomist review, on the grounds that the SSPX has not provided as of yet any such regular reading matter on the thought and doctrine of the Church’s great philosopher and theologian, St Thomas Aquinas. The answer is that this priest had better, at the least, be very careful, because Conciliar Thomism is a contradiction in real terms which can, in modernist terms, easily be made to seem – and here is the problem – non-contradictory.

Conciliar Thomism is a contradiction in real terms because the teaching of St Thomas strives, and in huge measure succeeds, to conform to the one and only order planted in real things outside our minds by the one and only real God. On the contrary, Vatican II proceeded from the supposition that modern man has destabilised this God-centred and static order in things (see the opening section of “Gaudium et Spes”), and therefore for God’s religion to make any sense to modern man, it must be re-cast in man-centred and dynamic terms which make Thomism no longer uniquely faithful to reality, but somewhat out of date.

In modernist terms Thomism may remain a historic monument of human thinking, a superb intellectual system, whose logic and consistency are wholly admirable. Thus SSPX seminarians, for instance, can learn it like a telephone directory, but if SSPX seminaries are being brought under the spell of Vatican II, the seminarians will no longer see Thomism as the one and only way to combat modern errors, and they will easily be charmed and seduced by many other more “up-to-date” ways of thinking about the world. In brief, modernists will not challenge Thomism on its own ground, indeed they can claim to agree with it entirely on its own ground. They will merely

claim that in modern times the ground has shifted, and so Thomism is no longer uniquely valid, or is no longer the one and only way of getting at truth. Thus followers of Vatican II can really think that they agree with Thomism, but they do not agree with it at all.

Let elementary arithmetic once more illustrate the point. Two and two are four, and in real life, in reality, they can be nothing else, neither three nor five. But a modern arithmetician might say, "To say that two and two are uniquely or exclusively four, is too narrow-minded. It is much more creative and progressive to say that they can also be five or six or – let us be open-minded – Six Million!" And because this modern arithmetician does not exclude two and two being four, but gladly includes it in his broad-mindedness, he can sincerely believe that his arithmetic does not contradict the old arithmetic. But who cannot see that in reality he is totally undermining the "old" and true arithmetic? That arithmetic which corresponds to the one reality outside our minds not only includes two and two being four, but also absolutely excludes their being anything else. And this arithmetic alone corresponds to that one reality, or, is true. Thus the believing and thinking which alone correspond to God's one order of natural and supernatural reality existed of course for many centuries before St Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274). He merely put it all together in an incomparable system. But it is not the system that makes it true. What makes it uniquely true as a system is its unique correspondence as a system to reality.

Therefore if the writers in this Thomistic review are also professed followers of Vatican II, they will surely not believe that Thomism is, in the sense presented here, unique. In which case they might be called telephone-book "Thomists," but they are certainly not true Thomists. Will the priest mentioned above always be able to distinguish? Not if he is letting himself right now be led towards Vatican II.

Kyrie eleison.

# BISHOP FELLAY – I

No. CDLXXIII (473)

August 6, 2016

Did the Society think it would save all?  
That was the pride which goes before a fall.

After the June 26–28 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Switzerland, the Superior General made not only for the general public the Communiqué of June 29, already examined in these “Comments” three weeks ago, but also a Statement on June 28 for the benefit of SSPX members, i.e. primarily SSPX priests. The Statement is in itself cryptic, but once deciphered (with the help of Fr Girouard), it is heavy with significance for the future of Catholic Tradition. Here is the merest outline of the first six paragraphs of the Statement, and the full text of the seventh:—

(1–4) Church and world are in crisis, because instead of turning around the Cross of Christ, they turn around man. The SSPX opposes this “deconstruction” of the Church and human society. (5) God’s own remedy for this disorder was to inspire an Archbishop to found a hierarchical Catholic Congregation turning around the sacrament of Holy Orders – Jesus Christ, his Cross, Kingship, sacrifice and priesthood, source of all order and grace, are what the Society founded by the Archbishop is all about.

(6) So the SSPX is neither Conciliar (it turns around Christ) nor rebellious (it is hierarchical).

(7) *“Has the moment come for the general restoration of the Church? God’s Providence does not abandon God’s Church whose head is the Pope, the Vicar of Christ. That is why an indisputable sign of the general restoration will be when the Pope gives a sign of what he wants by granting the means to restore order in the priesthood, Faith and Tradition. This sign will in addition guarantee the Catholic unity necessary to the family of Tradition.”*

Clearly the first six paragraphs lead up to the seventh. And it is not unreasonable to take the seventh to mean that when Pope Francis gives official approval to the Society, then that will be the proof that the moment has come at last for the whole of the Catholic Church to get back on its feet, for the Catholic priesthood, Catholic Faith

and Catholic Tradition to be restored, and for all Traditionalists to join with the Society of St Pius X behind its Superior General. Bishop Fellay would seem to be repeating here for the benefit of all Society priests his steady vision of the Society's glorious role, because at the Swiss meeting, as we hear, at least some of their Superiors had just questioned that glory coming in the form of reunion with official Rome. But those Superiors in opposition were right, because Bishop Fellay is here dreaming! It is a noble but deadly dream.

The dream is noble, because it is all to the honour of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of his Church, of his sacrifice, of Archbishop Lefebvre, of the Catholic priesthood and so on. The dream is deadly because it turns rather on the priesthood than on the Faith, and while it credits quite correctly Pope Francis and the Romans with being the holders of Church Authority, it takes no account of how far they are from holding the Catholic Faith. If Archbishop Lefebvre can be said to have saved the Catholic priesthood and Mass, that was for him only as a means of saving the Faith. The Faith is to the priesthood as end to means, and not as means to end. What would the priesthood be without the Faith? Who would believe in the Sacraments? Who would need priests?

And as to that Faith, the present Pope and the Roman officials who hold sway around him have lost their grip on Truth as being one, objective, non-contradictory and exclusive, and therewith they have lost their grip on the true Faith, not to say, lost the true Faith. That means that if Pope Francis did indeed approve officially of the Society, it would by no means be a sign of the Society restoring the Church to sanity, but rather of the official Church absorbing the Society into its insanity.

Kyrie eleison.



## BISHOP FELLAY – II

No. CDLXXIV (474)

*August 13, 2016*

Let us be hard in mind, in manners gentle.  
Softness of mind makes silly, sentimental.

An error is never properly refuted until it is uprooted. In other words truly to overcome an error one needs to show not only that it is an error, but why it is an error. Let us suppose, with last week's "Comments," that the June 28 statement of the Superior General of the Society of St Pius X, by looking forward to the Society's pious priesthood resolving the Church's crisis of Faith, commits the error of putting the cart of the priesthood before the horse of the Faith. Then let us show that this error has its roots in our age's almost universal undervaluing of the mind and overvaluing of the will, resulting even unconsciously in a scorn for doctrine (except for the Beatles' doctrine of "All you need is luv").

Already towards the beginning of the Statement there occurs a hint of this error when the Statement says that the central principle condemned in *Pascendi*, Pius X's great condemnation of modernism, is that of "independence." No. The principle he constantly condemns as being at the root of modernism is rather agnosticism, the doctrine that the mind can know nothing behind what appears to the senses. Upon that unknowing follows the independence of the mind from its object, followed in turn by the will's declaration of independence from everything else on which it does not want to depend. It is in the nature of things that the mind must first be suicided before the will can declare its independence. So when the Statement puts independence before agnosticism at the heart of *Pascendi*, that is a hint that the Statement is a part rather of the Church's problem than of its solution.

And where does this downgrading of the mind and doctrine in turn come from? Primarily from Luther who called human reason a "prostitute," and who more than anybody else launched Chistendom on the sentimental path to its self-destruction today. But that took all of 500 years? Yes, because there was natural and Catholic resistance along the way. But Luther was right when he told the Pope that in the end he would destroy him – "Pestis eram vivus, functus tua mors ero, Papa" – A plague to

you I was when I had breath, But once I'm dead, O Pope, I'll be your death.

To this radical and gigantic error of the downgrading of mind and doctrine may be attributed two sub-errors in the case of the author of the June 28 Statement: firstly, his misunderstanding of Archbishop Lefebvre, and secondly his too great understanding of Madame Cornaz (pen-name Rossinière).

Like many of us seminarians in Écône when Archbishop Lefebvre himself presided there, Bernard Fellay was rightly enchanted and bewitched by the outstanding example before our very eyes of what a Catholic priest could and should be. But the backbone of his priesthood and of his heroic fight for the Faith was not his piety – many modernists are “pious” – but his doctrine, doctrine of the eternal priesthood, profoundly allergic to liberalism and modernism. Nor did the Archbishop ever say that his Society would save the Church. Rather its priests were to safeguard the Church's priceless treasures for better days.

The person who did say that the Society's priests would save the Church, as Fr Ortiz has reminded us, was Madame Cornaz, a family mother from Lausanne, Switzerland, whose life spanned most of the 20th century, and who between 1928 and 1969 received communications supposedly from Heaven on how married couples should sanctify the priesthood (!). The communications started again in 1995 (!) when she met a Society priest whom she persuaded, and through him Bishop Fellay, that it was the SSPX priests who were destined by Providence to save the Church by propagating her “Homes of Christ the Priest.” With all his authority the Superior General supported her project, but the negative reaction of Society priests made him rapidly renounce it in public. Inwardly however, did her mystical vision of the Society's exalted future stay with him? It seems quite possible. Like Martin Luther King, the Superior General “has a dream.”

Kyrie eleison.

## BISHOP FELLAY – III

No. CDLXXV (475)

*August 20, 2016*

Three bishops told the truth, but “None so blind  
As he who will not see” – he shuts his mind.

Reading the two recent issues of these “Comments” on the mindset which induces the Superior General of the Society of St Pius X to pursue implacably a merely practical agreement with Church authorities in Rome, a good friend reminded me that the ideas driving him were laid out four years ago in his Letter of April 14, 2012, in which he replied to the Society’s three other bishops, who warned him seriously against making any merely practical agreement with Rome. Many readers today of these “Comments” may have forgotten, or never known of, that warning, or Bishop Fellay’s reply. Indeed the exchange of letters tells a great deal that is worth recalling. Here they are, summarised as cruelly as usual, with brief comments:—

The three bishops’ main objection to any practical agreement with Rome being made without a doctrinal agreement was the depth of the doctrinal gulf between Conciliar Rome and the Traditional Catholic Society. Half a year before he died Archbishop Lefebvre said that the more one analyses the documents and aftermath of Vatican II, the more one comes to realise that the problem is less any classic errors in particular, even such as religious liberty, collegiality and ecumenism, than “a total perversion of mind” in general, underlying all the particular errors and proceeding from “a whole new philosophy founded on subjectivism.” To a key argument of Bishop Fellay that the Romans are no longer hostile but benevolent towards the Society, the three bishops replied with another quote from the Archbishop: such benevolence is just a “manoeuvre,” and nothing could be more dangerous for “our people” than to “put ourselves into the hands of Conciliar bishops and modernist Rome.” The three bishops concluded that a merely practical agreement would tear the Society apart, and destroy it.

To this deep objection, as deep as the gulf between subjectivism and objective truth, Bishop Fellay replied (google Bishop Fellay, April 14, 2012):— 1 that the bishops were “too human and fatalistic.” 2 The Church is guided by the Holy Ghost. 3 Behind

Rome's real benevolence towards the SSPX is God's Providence. 4 To make the Council's errors amount to a "super-heresy" is an inappropriate exaggeration, 5 which will logically lead Traditionalists into schism. 6 Not all Romans are modernists because fewer and fewer of them believe in Vatican II, 7 to the point that were the Archbishop alive today he would not have hesitated to accept what the SSPX is being offered. 8 In the Church there will always be wheat and chaff, so Conciliar chaff is no reason to back away. 9 How I wish I could have turned to the three of you for advice, but each of you in different ways "strongly and passionately failed to understand me," and even threatened me in public. 10 To oppose Faith to Authority is "contrary to the priestly spirit."

And finally, the briefest of comments on each of Bishop Fellay's arguments:—

1 "Too human"? As the Archbishop said, the great gulf in question is philosophical (natural) rather than theological (supernatural). "Too fatalistic"? The three bishops were rather realistic than fatalistic. 2 Are Conciliar churchmen guided by the Holy Ghost when they destroy the Church? 3 Behind Rome's real malevolence is its firm resolve to dissolve the SSPX's resistance to the new Conciliar religion – as of how many Traditional Congregations before it! 4 Only subjectivists themselves cannot see the depth of the gulf between subjectivism and Truth. 5 Objectivist Catholics clinging to Truth are far from schism. 6 Freemasons hold the ring in Rome. Any non-modernists have no power there to speak of. 7 To believe that the Archbishop would have accepted Rome's present offers is to mistake him completely. The basic problem has got only much worse since his day. 8 Bishop Fellay's spoon is much too short for him to sup with the Roman devils (objectively speaking). 9 The three bishops understood Bishop Fellay only too well, but he did not want to hear what all three of them separately had to say. Does he take himself to be infallible? 10 St Paul for sure imagined that Authority could oppose Faith – Gal. I, 8–9, and II, 11. Did St Paul lack "priestly spirit"?

Kyrie eleison.

# AGAINST N.O.M.

No. CDLXXVI (476)

August 27, 2016

The sacrificial Mass once thrown away,  
How could poor Catholics not go astray?

The principle is clear in theory: to follow Our Lord we need, in the immortal words of St Augustine, to “slay the errors but love the erring.” That means that we should never so slay the errors as to slay also the erring (i.e. those who are in error, unless they are dangerous and incorrigible), and we should never so love the erring as to love also their errors. In practice it can be all too easy to slide from slaying the error into slaying the erring, or to slide from loving the erring into loving their error. In different words: “The Church is uncompromising in principle because she believes, she is tolerant in practice because she loves. The enemies of the Church are tolerant in principle because they do not believe, and uncompromising in practice because they do not love.” That is well said.

In case anybody still thinks that the author of these “Comments” slides from compassion for the misled sheep within the Novus Ordo into love of the errors of the New Mass of Paul VI, here are extracts from the letter of an older reader whose own bitter experience has led him to the conclusion that Novus Ordo Catholics do not deserve to be given too much benefit of the doubt. He has obviously run into some of the worst of the Newchurch. By its fruits . . .

*I was a typical grade school child in a parish of 2500 families in a neighbourhood that was nearly 60% Catholic. All of us were formed in the old religion, and when the Conciliar Revolution began destroying the Church in the 1970's we all of us had to sense that something was wrong. All Catholics have a duty to be faithful to Tradition and to find out where it lies, for instance in the reading materials available to everybody. For 50 years I myself have pleaded, begged and prayed for my Catholic friends and family to read the things that I have read, but they simply do not want to. The great majority enjoy the Conciliar religion: divorce and easy annulments, accommodating preachers, feminism, democracy, adultery, homosexuality and LUV hold them fast to the Novus Ordo, just the opposite of a love of truth.*

*I would say I know the Novus Ordo mentality because for over two years I came into close contact with Novus Ordo judges and priests and laity. I can assure you that it is not love of truth that motivates them. These Church authorities can be trusted to do exactly what nearly all, if not all, Novus Ordo catholics want them to do, which is to ignore their sinful lives. It seems as though the only 'sinners' they dare to admonish, instruct or counsel are smokers, polluters, insensitive Tradcats and overpopulators. Remember, more than 90% of married Catholics use birth control and teach their children to do the same. The Novus Ordo has become a global organisation of conscience placation and novelty on a grand scale. Novus Ordo Catholics really do believe that everybody goes to Heaven. To 'work out their salvation in fear and trembling' (Phil.II, 12) is not a thought they entertain.*

Birth control was in modern times a turning point from the will of God to the will of man. Not to use birth control for those living in a big city can seem almost impossible, but who got it wrong? God, or the modern city? God gave to his Church in 1968 a great chance to stay on track when he inspired a reluctant Paul VI to remain faithful to the Church's unchangeable doctrine, but a mass of churchmen were promptly unfaithful to the Pope. And the result was that "organisation of conscience placation" denounced above. And who can deny that the replacement of the true sacrifice of the Mass played from 1969 a huge part in Catholics giving up sacrificial lives to get to Heaven, in order to enjoy the easy life and go to Hell? What a responsibility of the priests!

Kyrie eleison.

# MARY'S GLORY

No. CDLXXVII (477)

September 3, 2016

Kyrie eleison. All glory Mary seeks is for her Son.  
For her own self she seeks no glory, none.

Between the Catholic Feasts of Our Lady's Assumption into Heaven (August 15) and Our Lady's Birthday (September 8), it may be a good moment to reflect upon a major Protestant objection to the devotion of Catholics to Our Lady, namely, all attention, honour and prayer directed towards Our Lady is so much taken away from Our Lord – he alone is our Redeemer, so to him alone should all our devotion, worship and prayer be directed. The following quotation, coming as from Our Lord himself, puts many such objections in a different perspective:—

*The human eye cannot stare at the sun, whereas it has no difficulty in gazing upon the moon. The spiritual eye of the human soul cannot behold the perfection of God as it is in itself, but it can look upon the perfection of Mary. Mary is like the moon with regard to the sun. By its light she is lit up, and that light is what she reflects upon yourselves, but she softens that light in a kind of spiritual mist by which it becomes bearable to behold for your limited nature. That is why for centuries it is her that I have been putting forward as a model for all of you that I wish to have as brothers, precisely as children of Mary, like myself.*

*She is the Mother. How sweet it is for children to look upon their mother! I gave her to you for that reason, so that you would have a gentle Majesty to behold, splendid enough to seize and to hold your gaze but not so brilliant as to dazzle your sight. Only to souls chosen out by me for special reasons which you cannot dispute have I shown myself in all the brilliance of the God-Man, absolute Intelligence and Perfection. However, the gift of that vision had to be accompanied by another gift to make living souls capable of enduring such knowledge of me without being annihilated by it.*

*Whereas all of you can look upon Mary. Not because she is like you, far from it! Her purity raises her so high that I, her Son and her God, treat her with veneration. Her perfection is so great that all Paradise bows before her throne which bathes in the changeless smile and everlasting brilliance of Our Threeness. But this brilliance which permeates and imbues her more than it does any other creature of God is tempered by the purest veils of her stainless*

*flesh through which she shines like a star, gathering together all of God's light and spreading it around like a gentle illumination upon all his creatures.*

*And then she is for ever your Mother. And she has all forms of the Mother's kindness, making excuses and interceding for you and patiently leading you on. Great is Mary's joy when she can say to a soul that loves her, "Love my Son." Great is my own joy when I can say to a soul that loves me, "Love my Mother." And greatest of all is our double joy when we see either a soul at my feet leaving me to go to my Mother, or one of you held in my Mother's arms leaving her to come to me. Because the Mother is jubilant when she can give to her Son more souls enamoured of her, and the Son is jubilant when he sees more souls loving his Mother. For when it comes to our glory neither of us seeks to overcome the other, the glory of each of us being complete in the glory of the other.*

*That is why I say to you, "My child, love Mary. I give her to you. She loves you, and with nothing but the gentleness of her smile she will light up your existence."*

If Catholics knew how to let her light shine through them, they would draw numberless souls towards her Son and towards God, as truly devout Protestants can only wish.



# ISLAM'S ORIGINS

No. CDLXXVIII (478)

*September 10, 2016*

Who profits by promoting Our Lord's foes?  
Those who serve God by scourging us with woes.

In recommending to readers "Plot Against the Church" by Maurice Pinay, a book which proves with a wealth of documents that the main external enemy of the Catholic Church for 2,000 years has been the Jews, these "Comments" stated that Jews were behind Islam, Freemasonry and Communism. No readers contested that they were behind Freemasonry and Communism, but a few asked what shows that they were also behind Islam. Indeed since Islam arose in the seventh century after Christ there is for Islam nothing like the documentation that exists for the modern roots of Freemasonry and Communism. In fact experts on Islam will say that even many original documents on the beginning of Islam may have been destroyed, precisely to cover up its true origins. We are left with the text of the Koran itself and historical arguments to point to Jews as the originators of Islam.

As for the text of the Koran, one who studied it closely before the Council, Hanna Zakarias, came to the conclusion in his book "True Mohammed, False Koran" that it was entirely the work of a Jewish Rabbi. To support his thesis that Islam is simply Judaism explained to Arabs by a Rabbi to convert them to the one true God of the Old Testament, Zakarias maintains that there is no story, no detail in the Koran that is not specifically Jewish, referring to the Old Testament, the Talmud or other Jewish literature. Only a Jew, he argues, could so glorify Israel as the Koran does, at the head of the nations, sole receiver of the one Revelation of the one true God. Thus passages in the Koran honouring for instance John the Baptist and the Blessed Virgin honour them purely as Jews, cutting out all connection to Christianity (Sourat XIX, 1-21). As for Jesus, he may have been the son of Mary, but he was certainly not the Son of God.

On the contrary a post-conciliar student of Islam, Laurent Lagartempe, states in his book "Origins of Islam" that there are many questions as to the historical person of Mohammed, and he argues that the Koran is a medley of disparate texts, more or less stabilized only two centuries after the beginning of Islam, to justify the new religion,

and to act as its holy text to rival with the Old and New Testaments of Moses and Jesus Christ respectively. But Lagartempe does not contest a significant presence of Judaism in the Koran, nor its influence.

As for the historical arguments for Jews being behind Islam, Pinay's book documents the well-known part played by Jews in helping the Arabs to conquer Catholic Spain between 711 and 788, reconquered by the Catholics only in 1492. Lagartempe reasonably supposes that the preceding Arab conquest of North Africa from 647 to 710 was also helped by the Jews, because those countries south of the Mediterranean, once a thriving part of Christendom, have ever since remained mostly under Arab control.

However, perhaps the main argument for Jews being behind Islam is of a more general order, and hardly disputable, resting on the quite special role played in history by the people of the Messiah, Our Lord Jesus Christ. To begin with, the training of the Israelites for that role by God himself stretched over 2,000 years from Abraham to Christ. See in the Old Testament how specially God both rewarded and punished them, to form them as the cradle of the Messiah to come. This formation gave to the Jews a quite special familiarity with the one true God, and they have never entirely lost it ever since. And that familiarity gives them a special ability to fabricate substitute religions that seem to satisfy men's real religious needs.

Alas, they refused their Messiah when he came, and that refusal gives them a special motivation to fabricate false religions to pull human beings away from Christ and away from eternal salvation. Here is why Maurice Pinay can show how they have fought down all the centuries against the Catholic Church. Today they are indisputably behind the Muslim invasion of the once Catholic nations of Europe, to dissolve the last remnants of the Faith, and so stop those nations from opposing their New World Order.

Kyrie eleison.

# <U>CHURCH'S</U> INFALLIBILITY

No. CDLXXIX (479)

September 17, 2016

Conciliar Popes I have to “disobey,”  
But that they are not Popes, I need not say.

From earth to Heaven go up problems. From heaven to earth come down solutions. Many a Catholic problem needs only to be taken on high to become rather less problematic. A classic example might be the problem of the Conciliar Popes, a problem with which we have been confronted since 2013 as never before, at least so brutally. There is in any case a mystery involved, but if we do not climb high enough, we fall easily prey to one of the two classic temptations: either he is the Pope so I must obey, or I cannot obey so he cannot be Pope. But if I climb above the humanity of the Pope to the divinity of the Church, then I realise that so-called Papal infallibility is actually Church infallibility, which leaves much more room for this or that Pope, or even a series of Popes, to be rather less than satisfactory. Let us go straight to the 1870 definition of infallibility, itself infallible. Here is the text, with some words highlighted, and figures inserted:—

*We teach and define that it is a dogma Divinely revealed that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra , that is when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, 1 by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he 2 defines 3 a doctrine regarding faith or morals 4 to be held by the universal Church, by the Divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that **his Church** should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are of themselves and not from the consent of the Church irreformable. —?Vatican Council, Sess. IV, Const. de Ecclesiâ Christi, Chapter iv.*

In this text we see clearly the famous four conditions for the Pope to be speaking infallibly, but we see also immediately following the two words here highlighted which seem to be not often noticed, but which make very clear where the Pope’s infallibility comes from: it comes not from himself but from the Church. Let us draw a familiar comparison from modern life, from a housewife plugging her electric iron

into a socket in the wall. For the iron to be heated, she must plug it into the socket, but the electricity which will then heat her iron comes obviously not from herself but from the local power station.

For a Papal definition to be infallible, the Pope must plug the four conditions into the Church, so to speak, and he is the one and only person on earth that can do that, which is why it is called “Papal infallibility,” but the infallible protection from error which he then obtains comes not from himself but from the Holy Ghost through the Church, somewhat as the electricity comes not from the housewife but from the power station through the socket. And so just as the housewife may have all kinds of personal qualities or defects, but just so long as she puts the plug into the socket, they make no difference to her iron being heated or not, similarly the Pope may be a Saint or much less than a saint, but if he is the duly appointed or elected Pope, then from the moment that he engages the four conditions, his definition will be necessarily free from error.

What this means is that whenever the Pope does not engage those four conditions, strictly speaking he can talk nonsense just like the rest of us, without the Church ceasing to be infallible. And in fact her Ordinary Infallibility is much more important than this Extraordinary Infallibility of Papal definitions, as previous issues of these “Comments” sought to illustrate with another familiar comparison, that between a mountain and its snowcap (see ECs 343 and 344, Feb 8 and 15 of 2014). The snowcap may provide greater visibility, but to be visible where it is seen it totally depends on the mountain’s bulk beneath it. So once we take the problem on high, it is not so important for the Church if the Conciliar Popes are out of their minds. We may suffer here below from fallible Popes, but Mother Church remains serenely infallible.

Kyrie eleison.

# BEAUTIFUL CHEESE

No. CDLXXX (480)

September 24, 2016

The tastier the bait put on the hook,  
The more poor fish their foes for friends mistook.

In Australia just one month ago the Superior General of the Society of St Pius X painted a glowing picture of his – as he hopes – imminent subjection of the Society to the officials of Conciliar Rome. From a long discourse here are a few significant remarks he made, summarised or quoted in full (in italics):—

[ . . . ] *Rome is offering us **a new structure**. At its head will be **a bishop, chosen by the Pope** from a list of three Society members, named by the Society. He will have authority over priests, over any religious wanting to join the new structure and over Catholics belonging to the new structure. These will have an absolute right to receive from Society priests all the sacraments, including marriage. This bishop will be able to set up schools and seminaries, to ordain ( priests ), to establish new religious Congregations. The structure will be like a super-diocese, independent of all local bishops. *In other words, for you faithful, **there will be no change** from what you are already enjoying with the Society. The only difference will be that **you will be officially recognized as Catholics**.**

You can easily imagine that there will be clashes with the local bishops. *So we must be prudent, but as things stand you cannot imagine anything better than this offer, which is such that you cannot think it is a trap. **It is not a trap , and if anyone makes us such an offer it can only be because he wishes us well** . He wants Tradition to prosper and to flourish within the Church. It is impossible that such an offer could come from our enemies. They have many other ways to crush us, but not that way [ . . . ].*

The remarks highlighted here in heavy print call for comment:—

\* A “new structure” means presumably that Archbishop Lefebvre’s structure for the Society will, essentially, be abandoned. Rome is creating a completely new entity. Good-bye, dear SSPX.

\* A “bishop chosen by the Pope” is extremely important. And the head of the “new

structure” will presumably go on being chosen by the Pope. Ask the Fraternity of St Peter what that means. It meant in the 1990’s their own choice of Superior General being overridden by Rome, so that Rome’s own choice was forcibly installed (Fr. A. D.), to bring St Peter’s to heel.

\* Note also how this bishop will be able “to ordain (priests)” but not bishops. Rome will thus retain the whip-hand over the new entity.

\* “There will be no change”? But of course there will! Rome will henceforth be in control.

\* “You will be officially recognized” – but what Catholic needs any recognition by such destroyers of the Church as her present neo-modernist officials? Any such recognition can only be a bad sign.

\* “Not a trap . . .”? This whole paragraph is truly remarkable. The author of these “Comments” feels obliged to turn to Mickey Mouse and to his beloved partner, Minnie Mouse, for comment:—

Mickey: Darling, can you smell that delicious cheese that I can smell? Oh look, here it is!

Minnie: But Mickey, it’s a mousetrap, set by the owner of the house to get rid of us. Can’t you see that?

Mickey: It cannot be a trap! I tell you, if anyone offers us such good cheese, it can only be because he wishes us well. It’s clear that he wants us mice to prosper and flourish inside his house.

Minnie: (imploringly) Oh darling, can’t you remember how many of our cousins died this way?

Mickey: For the last time, I tell you – and I am never wrong – it is impossible for such delicious cheese to come from our enemies! They could never use that way to crush us.

Minnie: (with a deep sigh) There is no better way to crush us! And how many more of our friends and relatives are going to follow your lead? Oh, masculine pride!

Forgive the frivolity, dear readers – there is reason to fear we are dealing with a real Disneyland!

Kyrie eleison.

# AGAIN, SEDEVACANTISM – I

No. CDLXXXI (481)

October 1, 2016

The Catholic Church can never wholly fail,  
But, partially, it can severely ail.

It may irk a number of readers of these “Comments” if they return once more to the theme of the Conciliar Popes not being Popes at all, but the recent translation into French of an article from 1991 in English shows how the arguments for sedevacantism need repeatedly to be demonstrated as being not so conclusive as they may appear. Liberals need no such demonstration, because for them sedevacantism is no temptation. However there are select Catholic souls drawn by the grace of God out of liberalism towards Catholic Tradition for whom sedevacantism becomes positively dangerous. The Devil does not care whether we lose our balance to the right or to the left, so long as we lose our balance.

For indeed the error of sedevacantism may in theory be an error neither as deep nor as grave as the universal mind-rot of liberalism, but in practice how often one observes that minds snap shut with sedevacantism, and that what started out as an acceptable opinion (what Catholic can say that the words and deeds of Pope Francis are Catholic?), tends to become an unacceptable dogmatic certainty (what Catholic can judge with certainty of such a question?), and from there to impose itself as the dogma of dogmas, as though a person’s Catholicity is to be judged by whether or not he believes in our having had no real Pope since, say, Pius XII.

One reason offered by previous “Comments” for this often observed internal dynamic of sedevacantism may be the Gordian-knot simplicity with which it slices through an agonizing and faith-threatening problem: “How can these destroyers of the Church be true Catholic Popes?” Answer, they are not Popes at all. “Oh, what a relief! I need no longer agonize.” The mind snaps shut, sedevacantism is to be shared as though it were the Gospel with whoever will listen (or not listen), and at worst it can be extended from the Popes to all cardinals, bishops and priests, so that a once believing Catholic turns into a “home-aloner” who gives up attending Mass altogether. Will he succeed in keeping the Faith? And his children? Here is the danger.



Therefore to keep our Catholic Faith in balance and to avoid the traps laid today to its right as to its left, let us look at the arguments of BpS in the 15-page article mentioned above. (“BpS” is an abbreviation which many readers will identify at once, but it need not be spelled out here because we are more concerned with his arguments than with his person.) In his article at least he does think, and he does have a Catholic’s faith in the Papacy, otherwise the Conciliar Popes would be no problem for him. This logic and faith are what is best in sedevacantists, but neither BpS nor they are working from the whole picture: God cannot let go of his Church, but he can let go of his churchmen.

For here is his argument in a nutshell – Major: the Church is indefectible. Minor: at Vatican II the Church went liberal, which was a major defection. Conclusion: the Conciliar Church is not the real Church, which means that the Conciliar Popes who led or followed Vatican II cannot have been real Popes.

The argument looks good. However, from the very same Major and Minor can come a liberal Conclusion: the Church is indefectible, the Church went liberal, so I too, as a Catholic, must go liberal. That sedevacantism thus shares its roots with liberalism should make any sedevacantist think twice. BpS notices the common roots, and calls them “ironic,” but they are much more than that. They point to liberals and sedevacantists making the same error, which must be in the Major. Indeed both alike misunderstand the Church’s indefectibility, as they mistake the Popes’ infallibility. See these “Comments” next week for a more detailed analysis of BpS’s argument.

Kyrie eleison.

## SEDEVACANTISM AGAIN – II

No. CDLXXXII (482)

October 8, 2016

The Church which sedevax attempt to save  
In fact to human limits they enslave.

For any Catholic soul realizing today the gravity of the crisis in the Church and agonizing over it, the simplicity of sedevacantism dismissing as invalid the Church and Popes of Vatican II can become a serious temptation. Worse, the seeming logic of the ecclesiavacantists' and sedevacantists' arguments can turn that temptation into a mental trap which can at worst lead a Catholic to lose his faith altogether. That is why these "Comments" will return in more detail to the main argument of the scattershot of arguments laid out in the article by BpS from 1991 mentioned here last week. Here again is that argument:—

Major: the Catholic Church is absolutely indefectible (it has God's own guarantee that it will last to the end of the world – cf. Mt XXVIII, 20). Minor: But the Conciliar or Novus Ordo Church, overwhelmed by neo-modernism and liberalism, represents an absolute defection. Conclusion: the Novus Ordo Church is absolutely not Catholic and its Popes are absolutely not Popes. In other words the Church is absolutely white while the Newchurch is absolutely black, so Church and Newchurch are absolutely different. To minds which like to think in black and white with nothing in between, this argument has much appeal. But to minds which recognize that in real life things are often grey, or a mixture of black and white (without black ceasing to be black or white ceasing to be white), the argument is too absolute to be true. Thus in the Major there is an exaggeration of the Church's indefectibility, and in the Minor there is an exaggeration of the Newchurch's defection. Theory can be absolute, but reality rarely is absolute. Let us look at indefectibility and the Conciliar defection as they are in reality.

As for the Major, sedevacantists frequently exaggerate the Church's indefectibility, just as they frequently exaggerate the Popes' infallibility, because that is what they need to support their emotional horror at what has become of the Catholic Church since the Council. But in reality just as that infallibility does not exclude great errors of

some Popes in Church history and only applies when the Pope is either, Ordinarily, saying what the Church has always said, or, Extraordinarily, is engaging all four conditions of the 1870 definition, so the Church's indefectibility does not absolutely exclude some huge defections at given moments of Church history, such as the triumphs of Islam or Protestantism or of the Antichrist (Lk. XVIII, 8), it only excludes absolutely a total defection, or total failure (Mt. XXVIII, 20). Thus indefectibility is not as absolute as BpS pretends.

As for the Minor, it is true that the defection of Conciliarism is considerably more grave than that of either Islam or Protestantism because it strikes at the head and heart of the Church in Rome, which they did not do. Nevertheless even half a century of Conciliarism (1965 to 2016) has not made the Church totally defect, or fail. For instance Archbishop Lefebvre – and he was not alone – held high the Faith from 1970 to 1991, his successors did the same, more or less, from 1991 to 2012, and the embattled “Resistance” upholds his line still, and before the Church humanly collapses in a not too distant future, unquestionably its indefectibility will be divinely saved, just as before world's end – Mt. XXIV, 21–22. Thus Conciliarism as a defection of the Church is not as absolute as BpS pretends, either.

So his syllogism needs to be recast – Major: the Church's indefectibility does not exclude huge defections but only a total defection. Minor: Vatican II was a huge but not total defection of the Church (even if Catholics aware of its danger must totally avoid it, for fear of contamination). Conclusion: the Church's indefectibility does not exclude Vatican II. In brief, God's own Church is bigger than all the wickedness of Devil or man, even Vatican II. The Conciliar defection may well be of an unprecedented gravity in all Church history, but the Church's indefectibility and the Popes' infallibility come from God and not from men. Like liberals, the sedevacantists are thinking humanly, all too humanly.

Kyrie eleison.

# CATHOLICS' DISTRESS

No. CDLXXXIII (483)

October 15, 2016

What does the Lord God want of me and you?  
To do what we can, not what we cannot do.

A world wanting less and less of God constantly wears down Catholics. Here is another reader's cry:—

*I ask myself, how is it possible to keep the Faith in the general situation of the Church today with its absolute lack of shepherds? For a few months we were with the Society of St Pius X, months which taught us the value of Tradition. We looked into the story of Archbishop Lefebvre's struggle, and we saw how he is being betrayed. We followed the "Resistance" through the website of Non Possumus. For a few months we were deceived by Fr. C., who calls it "Desistence." We were undeceived and left his group. Now we can no longer go to the Society because they insist that we join in certain activities, meetings of altar-boys and so on. They require information about us, and to find it out send our way married couples heavily committed to the Society. Much of the time we spend trying not to say things that would prevent us from receiving Holy Communion, as happens to some people because they are against Pope Francis, or for the "Resistance." Right now we are going to the Catholic Maronite Church where at least the Consecration is valid. But we are disappointed to observe that they accept Vatican II in general, and they asked me to allow my girls to serve on the altar. When I refused, they said "We are all children of God," and so on, to prevent discrimination against females serving on the altar.*

*I have nobody I can go to Confession to. I have a continual struggle at work where I never stop speaking of God and of current events, despite the school being secular and secularist, so that the personnel are all employees of the State. Following your advice to withdraw into the shadows to prepare for the descent into the catacombs I am wary of social contacts, but it is difficult to fight on your own. We are now in contact with people of T.F.P. (Tradition, Family, Property). I am not sure what their doctrine is. But what can we do? The struggle is weighing down heavily upon me. In one school where I work one professor is to my knowledge a Freemason. Despite its being a State school, its whole orientation is religious, but in a deistic way, i.e. without Christ. What can I do? In this country there is nothing left,*

*and we are at our wits' end.*

Amongst other things I wrote back to him that when the Church is being taken along the Way of the Cross to be crucified, as is happening today, then the only way not to have to carry a splinter of that Cross is not to be a Catholic. Obviously this reader wants to remain Catholic in order to get himself and his family to Heaven. So he should not be surprised to find himself suffering from splinters of Our Lord's Cross. When he should be really worrying is when he would find himself at ease in this world around him.

As for his workplace, there is not much he can do about it. Social contacts should be maintained with prayer, charity and example, because we human beings are social animals, but let our limited energy and resources not be exhausted in throwing pearls before swine. Our Lord tells us not to condemn if we do not want to be condemned, but he also tells us to discern between wolves and true shepherds (Mt.VII, 15). So a Catholic is bound to exercise his best judgment on the variety of priests and layfolk that he meets with in the chaos of today's Church. And in any case a family father must today lead his own family in the five-Mystery family Rosary every night (or better, morning). That will ensure that Our Lady will protect his family as only she can do through whatever grave events lie ahead of us.

Kyrie eleison.

# IRON RATIONS

No. CDLXXXIV (484)

October 22, 2016

When Catholic institutions fall to bits,  
The priests must help the home to take the hits.

In military affairs, it is normal for generals and soldiers alike to have in mind rather the last war than the one they are now fighting. Who imagined trench warfare before World War I? Yet by World War II the inter-war development of tanks had made trenches obsolete. Similarly in religious affairs. The 21st is no longer the 20th century. Surely Resistant Catholics since 2012 are unwise to be hoping for anything like the establishment and expansion of the Society of St Pius X in the last century. For example, from two admirable Resistants of today come a general and a particular lament, neither perhaps altogether wise . . .

The general lament is that the “Resistance” is falling apart rather than making headway. These “Comments” often put inverted commas around the word “Resistance,” precisely to suggest that the Catholic resistance to the Conciliarisation of the SSPX is not yet any kind of organisation but rather a vague movement with a precise aim, to save the Catholic Faith, but with as yet little structure to help it to do so. However, let Resistants take heart, because while man proposes, God disposes, so that what can look like a human failure may not be a failure from the standpoint of Almighty God.

Thus in the 1970’s Archbishop Lefebvre proposed to rally half a dozen Catholic bishops so as to throw up a real roadblock in the way of the Conciliarists then destroying the Church, but God disposed differently. In this purpose of his the Archbishop would fail, but in trying he would succeed in building a worldwide treasure-house to safeguard the treasures of the Church’s doctrine, Mass and priesthood for better times. Similarly now there are Resistants proposing to build a replacement for the endangered SSPX, and their apparent weakness (at least up till now) may suggest that any such large-scale replacement is not in the plans or dispositions of Almighty God. However, in trying, Resistants are ensuring (at least for now) the survival of the Catholic Faith, which is certainly a disposition of Providence.

The particular lament is that if only the “Resistance” had schools, many SSPX parents would swell the ranks of the “Resistance” as they cannot now do, because their children would immediately be thrown out of the SSPX schools to which there is presently no decent alternative. But again, we are fighting for the Faith in the 21st, not in the 20th century. Back in the 1980’s there were still enough like-minded Catholic parents and teachers and priests to form that triangular frame within which the children almost have to grow up straight. But today? Today one learns of an SSPX boys’ school that has been in serious difficulties because of an outbreak within its walls of that sin against nature which cries to Heaven for vengeance. But what walls can stop adolescents from getting to know of that sin’s glorification among the mass of their country’s male adults, and of a new word invented to condemn the new vice of its condemnation – “homophobia”? And since when are adolescents not to imitate their adults? In fact, how can anyone run a boys’ school since the invention of the Internet, with pocket access to it? Are Catholic institutions still possible?

In today’s religious war, surely the order of the day is iron rations, meaning the soldiers’ strict necessary for survival, here to keep the Faith. This war must be won in the home, or it will be lost. God gives to parents a natural power to form their children that overwhelms by, say, five to two the power of any institution to deform them, but only as long as parents take hold of their power. A small rudder can steer a big ship, but not if the steersman lets go of it. If parents let go of their children, they cannot blame the world for steering them to Hell. And if any parents have wanted SSPX schools to qualify their children for the world rather than for Heaven, may not here be one important reason why the SSPX has slidden?

Kyrie eleison.

# DISINTEGRATION

No. CDLXXXV (485)

October 29, 2016

It's true, we men today are broken down,  
But that can brighten many a heavenly crown.

*Things fall apart, the centre cannot hold,  
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world.  
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere  
The ceremony of innocence is drowned.  
The best lack all conviction, while the worst  
Are full of a passionate intensity.*

These famous lines from *The Second Coming*, a poem written in 1919 in the wake of the First World War by the Anglo-Irish poet, W.B. Yeats (1865–1939), come to mind as a possible explanation of how the movement of resistance to the 2012 betrayal of Archbishop Lefebvre's Society of St Pius X can be so strong in truth and yet weak in unity and numbers. 1919 is nearly a hundred years ago, and Yeats was neither Catholic nor particularly concerned with the condition of the Catholic Church, which did then seem to be flourishing. But poets can be visionaries, and Yeats caught in these lines an essential truth about Western civilisation as it emerged from that war that was “putting out the lights all over Europe” (Earl Grey): the Western nations were spiritually disintegrating in a process uninterrupted ever since.

Nevertheless many Catholics today who wish the Faith to survive are upset by the apparent weakness of the “Resistance” of Archbishop Lefebvre's own priests in particular to the obvious betrayal of his principles by their present leaders, and they look for an explanation. Some think that the SSPX priests do not take a public stand against the false conciliation of Tradition with Vatican II because they are scared of being thrown out of the Society with nowhere to sleep and nothing to eat. But the priests have to know that there are layfolk who would be glad to support them. A deeper explanation might be that the priests are scared of cutting themselves out of that Society which is both their human family and the framework by which they belong to the structural Church. But again with a strong enough faith they would



know that Providence can supply for both needs.

On the other hand if we set the 2012 sell-out of the Society in the context of the double disintegration of the two World Wars, followed by the far more terrible disintegration of the Catholic Church at Vatican II (1962–1965), then we must admire the heroic feat of Archbishop Lefebvre in gathering together flying fragments from that unprecedented explosion, but we can hardly be surprised if the Society of St Pius X should in turn explode from within, or if refugees from its disintegration should have difficulty in re-integrating without. Things have fallen apart, and minds and hearts with them. I think that there is not enough integrity or integration left in hearts and minds for us to be able to think of repeating the Archbishop's feat. We are nearly 50 years downhill from 1970 when the Archbishop founded the SSPX.

What that means is not that there is nothing to be done, but that what is to be done must be worked out more from God's point of view and less from man's. At the very end of the world, God will allow the Faith almost to disappear (Lk XVIII, 8), but there will still be a few souls believing, hoping and loving. In 2016 he is giving us a foretaste of that disappearance, but souls should be able to recognize that they still have considerable freedom to believe, hope and love. And they should be able to foresee that even the most powerful of police states will not have the power to stop them from doing so. Moreover, the more heavily circumstances are made to weigh upon that freedom, the more glorious in Heaven will be the persevering devotion of any soul to God, to his divine Son and to the Blessed Virgin, and the greater will be the merits of that soul. Above all, the greater will be its unstoppable contribution to the welfare of the Church. All is by no means lost, and it can never be lost. God's Church is not a merely human affair.

Kyrie eleison.

# CHURCHMEN AWARE? – I

No. CDLXXXVI (486)

November 5, 2016

When men destroy God's work, are they aware?  
They must have seen, at first. Churchmen, take care!

A reader of these "Comments" just raised a question once often asked, now probably less often, but still of interest: is the Superior General of the Society of St Pius X (SG for short) aware of how he contradicts himself? – in July of this year he called for a new Rosary Crusade "exclusively" to obtain the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart through the Consecration of Russia, while more recently he claimed that Rome wants the SSPX to fill important positions in the Church to help it to overcome modernism. The contradiction is clear, because the churchmen presently holding position in Rome are certainly opposed to the Consecration as asked for by Our Lady, and the reasons for that run deep.

Write to Fr Guy Castelain at Le Moulin du Pin, F53290 Beaumont-Pied-de-Boeuf, France, for a copy of the excellent editorial in his SSPX bulletin of this month, where he lays out ten reasons why Vatican II is the main obstacle to Our Lady's Consecration of Russia. In very brief, the Consecration represents political involvement against political neutrality, the reign of Christ against his dethronement, Catholicism against religious liberty, the Pope against collegiality, the one true religion against ecumenism, the Immaculate Heart against a glorification of human dignity forgetting original maculation or sin, the one true Church against salvation in other religions, peace by the Catholic Pope against peace by "the Spirit of Assisi," and so on. No wonder Pope Francis told Vladimir Putin who came to see him and expressed an interest in the Consecration: "We do not speak about Fatima"!

Now human politics and politicians can solve by compromise many a human clash between man and man, but Fr Castelain's ten reasons prove that the clash between Fatima and the Conciliarists is no less than the clash between the "old" religion of Rome, as fresh as eternity, and the "new" religion of Vatican II, as stale as sin. Here is one of those clashes between God and man where political compromise is out of the question. In 1973 had not Our Lady warned in Akita, Japan, that "... the Church will

be filled with agents of compromise . . .” The question for the SG then becomes, is he aware that he is an “agent of compromise”? Does he or does he not see that he is promoting an irreconcilable contradiction? If he does see it, then he is a liar, either when he promotes Fatima or when he protects the Conciliarists, or both. If on the contrary he does not see it, then he is blind.

A number of Catholics are by now convinced that his latest call for a Rosary Crusade is merely a political ploy to deceive his more Traditional followers. Certainly in his first term as SG plenty of his words and deeds indicate that he did then see the clash as clearly as Archbishop Lefebvre saw it. But there must have come a turning-point since then when instead of holding to the interests of God he wished also to serve the interests of men. It cannot be done (Mt. VI, 24; Gal. I, 10), but like many of us, he wanted to have his cake and eat it, and nature is expert at dressing itself up as grace, says the *Imitation of Christ*. So there must have followed a time of transition when he was wilfully blind, but if wilful blindness goes on for too long, it turns into habitual blindness, which is a terrible punishment from God. Assuredly between 2006 and 2008 Our Lady obtained for him more than enough graces to see what he was doing, but like the Conciliarists and Macbeth, instead he “waded on in blood” (Act III, Scene 4) – that of the Church. Like the Conciliarists in Rome, he certainly needs our prayers.

Readers, if you wish to see clear, pray the Rosary, and if in our dark times you wish never to stop seeing clear, pray all 15 Mysteries of the Rosary every day. The Mother of God cannot fail you.

Kyrie eleison.

## CHURCHMEN AWARE? – II

No. CDLXXXVII (487)

*November 12, 2016*

Corrupted minds make words of little use  
Except to lie, mislead, betray, seduce.

Last week these “Comments” raised the question whether the Superior General of the Society of St Pius X (SG for short) knows what he is doing when he constantly makes contradictory statements, now in favour of Catholic Tradition, now in line with the Romans and their Conciliar Revolution. At best the SG would be merely a confused and confusing liberal, torn between Catholicism and Conciliarism. At worst he could be a true wolf in sheep’s clothing, using words merely as political instruments to enable the Romans to absorb Archbishop Lefebvre’s once Catholic Society into their Conciliar Newchurch. The Faith is at stake. It is important for many priests and laity alike to see clearly whether the SG is shepherd or wolf, or somewhere in between. See the latest issue of the French bi-monthly magazine, “Sous la Bannière,” for a very clear answer by a Resistant French priest, Fr Olivier Rioult.

He starts out from the SG’s June 29 communiqué which followed on the SSPX Superiors’ meeting held just previously near Écône, and he quotes from it sentences which might re-assure some Catholics that the SSPX is coming back on Traditional track. But, says Fr Rioult, the SG has in the past so often said one thing and done another that his words are of no value so far as truth is concerned. They are, as for countless modern politicians, merely instruments of policy to be used or abused as the occasion requires, in this case to make the SSPX submit to Newchurch authorities without its even realizing what is happening. The proof is in the SG’s actions. Actions speak always louder than words. What the SG really means is best judged by his actions, which work steadily in favour of Conciliar Rome.

Here are some of them – the acceptance of the “excommunications” being “lifted” in 2009; the acceptance of official jurisdiction for confessions, and of official jurisdiction for the SG to deliver first instance judgments of cases within the SSPX; the submission to quoting of names for priestly ordinands in the USA, and acceptance of diocesan toleration for priestly ordinations in Germany. Going in the same direction

within the SSPX is his steady demotion or purging of opponents to his Roman policy, and his promotion of docile substitutes, often youngsters relatively unfit for the heavier responsibilities. And Fr Rioult points out that this series of actions is clearly in line with the joint statement of the SG and Rome's Number Two, Cardinal Müller, issued after their meeting in September of 2014, that they would "proceed in stages . . . taking the time necessary to iron out difficulties . . . with a view to achieving full reconciliation."

This step-by-step procedure, says Fr Rioult, has the great advantage for both parties of avoiding any clear-cut moment such as the joint signing of a public document which would risk alerting followers of Tradition to what was going on. As it is, the SG's contradictions create confusion, and if only they are "subtle" or "delicate" enough, put Catholics to sleep who are not watching and praying. Thus the SG's words are merely laid down as a smokescreen to disguise especially from SSPX priests what he is really up to, because if enough of them were awake and aware, it would be that much more difficult for him to persuade Rome that he could bring the whole Society into the Newchurch, which is what Rome wants, to put an end to the main body of resistance to their New World Order religion. Already in 2012 the SG had the bitter experience of setting up everything, as he thought, for the sell-out, only to have Rome refuse the agreement because at that moment in time his three fellow-bishops in the SSPX were all against it, as Rome well knew. The Newchurch needs to cripple Tradition, once and for all.

Pray for SSPX priests, that they see through the Menzingen mafia, block it, and finally get rid of it.

Kyrie eleison.

# EXCELLENT COMMUNIQUÉ?

No. CDLXXXVIII (488)

November 19, 2016

Superiors putting cushions under lies  
Make Catholics' non-reaction no surprise.

On October 31 Pope Francis held in Sweden an ecumenical meeting with leading Lutherans to prepare for next year's 500th anniversary of Luther's revolt against the Catholic Church. After the meeting the Pope signed with the President of the Lutheran World Federation a joint Declaration, which is yet another utter scandal, coming as it does from the man who is meant to be the Vicar of Christ. On November 2, in protest, the Superior of the French District of the Society of St Pius X issued a Communiqué to condemn that scandalous Declaration. Much of the Communiqué is excellent, and it should be what is needed from Society Superiors in order to place a serious obstacle in the way of the Archbishop's Society being betrayed to the Roman neo-modernists, but the conclusion is weak, and so the Communiqué may have the opposite effect.

Fr Bouchacourt opens his Communiqué by stating that the scandal of the Pope's pro-Lutheran Declaration is such that he "cannot keep silent." And the whole passage where he denounces Luther is beyond reproach. Here it is:—

*How can we be "profoundly thankful for the spiritual and theological gifts received through the Reformation" (quotation from the joint Declaration) , when Luther manifested a diabolical hatred towards the Sovereign Pontiff, a blasphemous scorn for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, as well as a refusal of the saving Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ? He also destroyed the doctrine on the Eucharist by refusing Transsubstantiation, turned souls away from the Most Blessed Virgin Mary and denied the existence of Purgatory. No, Protestantism brought nothing to Catholicism! It ruined the unity of Christendom, separated whole countries from the Catholic Church, plunged souls into error, putting their eternal salvation in peril. We Catholics want Protestants to return to the unique fold of Christ which is the Catholic Church, and we pray for this intention. In these days when we celebrate all the Saints, we call out to Saint Pius V, Saint Charles Borromeo, Saint Ignatius and Saint Peter Canisius who heroically fought the Protestant heresy and saved the Catholic Church.*

But compared with this denunciation, Fr. Bouchacourt's conclusion is relatively lame:—

*We invite the faithful of the District of France to pray and do penance for the Sovereign Pontiff so that Our Lord, whose Vicar he is, may preserve him from error and keep him in the Truth of which he is the guardian. I invite the priests of the District to celebrate a Mass of reparation and to organise a Holy Hour before the Blessed Sacrament, to ask pardon for these scandals and to beg Our Lord to calm the tempest which has been shaking the Church for more than half a century now. Our Lady Help of Christians, save the Catholic Church and pray for us!*

Fr Christian Bouchacourt, SSPX French District Superior.

This conclusion is pious, and perfectly respectful towards Pope Francis, but does it give any idea of the gravity of the Pope's disorientation when the Pope so praises one of the greatest anti-Christian heretics in all Church history? It is difficult to imagine Fr Bouchacourt not having obtained from Bishop Fellay prior permission to publish his Communiqué. Was it Bishop Fellay who had no problem with the Luther of 500 years ago being denounced, but insisted on toning down the criticism of the major wrecker of the Church here and now? In any case the Communiqué serves Bishop Fellay's purpose of deceiving Traditional priests and laity and putting them to sleep by suggesting that the supposedly imminent Personal Prelature will prevent none of them from denouncing Papal scandals, etc . . .

Then does Fr Bouchacourt realize how, like his predecessor, he may be serving, even against his own will, the betrayal of the Society? Let us be "simple as doves" but also "as wise as serpents" (Mt. X, 16).

Kyrie eleison.

## FIVE “DUBIA”

No. CDLXXXIX (489)

*November 26, 2016*

Four Cardinals obliged a Pope to tell –  
His deep convictions come from deepest Hell.

In a scandal of a gravity unprecedented even in Pope Francis’ scandal-ridden reign as Catholic Pope since 2013, when challenged by four honourable Cardinals on his seeming denial of the very basis of the Church’s teaching on morals, he has just given answers in public which virtually affirm the freedom of man from the moral law of Almighty God. With this papal affirmation of the Conciliar religion of man as opposed to the Catholic religion of God, a schism in the Universal Church draws that much closer. For half a century since Vatican II, the Conciliar Popes have managed to remain in a way the one head of two opposing religions, but that contradiction could not last indefinitely, and it must soon result in a split.

In 2014 and 2015 Francis held Synods in Rome to consult the world’s bishops on questions concerning the human family. On March 19 of this year he published his post-synodal Apostolic Exhortation on “Love in the Family,” the eighth of whose nine chapters raised controversy from the very start. On September 15 four Cardinals in particular sent to the Pope a private and perfectly respectful letter in which they asked him as Supreme Pontiff to clear up five “dubia” or doubtful points of doctrine, left unclear in the Exhortation. Here is the essence of the five points:—

1 From the Exhortation’s #305, can a married person living like husband and wife with a person not their lawful spouse from now on be given sacramental Absolution and Communion while they continue to live in their quasi-married state?

2 From #304, need one still believe that there are absolute moral norms which prohibit intrinsically evil acts, and which are binding without exception?

3 From #301, can one still say that a person living in violation of one of God’s commandments, e.g. in adultery, is in an objective state of grave habitual sin?

4 From #302, can one still say that the circumstances or intentions surrounding an act intrinsically evil by its object can never change it into being subjectively good, or



acceptable as a choice?

5 From #303, must we still exclude any creative role of conscience, so that conscience may still never authorize exceptions to absolute moral norms which forbid acts intrinsically evil by their object?

To these five designedly yes-or-no questions the answer of the Catholic Church from Our Divine Lord onwards has always been clear, and has never changed: Communion may not be given to adulterers; there are absolute moral norms; there is such a thing as “grave habitual sin”; good intentions cannot make evil acts good; conscience cannot make evil acts lawful. In other words, to the five yes-or-no, black-or-white questions, the Church’s answer has always been, 1 No, 2 Yes, 3 Yes, 4 Yes, 5 Yes.

On November 16, just ten days ago, the four Cardinals made their letter public (cf. Mt.XVIII, 15–17). On Nov. 18, in an interview given to the Italian newspaper *Avvenire*, Pope Francis gave the exact opposite yes-or-no answers: 1 Yes, 2 No, 3 No, 4 No, 5 No. (He did affirm each time that “Such things are not black-or-white, we are called to discern,” but he was merely attempting thereby to confuse the unmoving questions of principle with moving questions of application of principle, which come after the questions of principle.)

All credit to the four Cardinals for obtaining light and truth for many confused sheep that wish to get to Heaven: Brandmüller, Burke, Caffarra and Meisner. They may be immersed in the Novus Ordo, but they have obviously not lost all courage or sense of their duty. There can be no question of their having acted out of any but the best of motives in pressing the Pope to make himself clear. And where does that clarity leave the Church? It must be on the brink of schism.

Kyrie eleison.

# NOM MIRACLES?

No. CDXC (490)

*December 3, 2016*

Traditional Catholics must be broad of mind –  
Not only faithlessness they left behind.

In the United States last year there arose a serious controversy as to whether God can work miracles within the framework of the Novus Ordo Mass. Now if God does work supernatural miracles, it is obviously for them to be believed in, so that they will strengthen people's supernatural faith. And if he wants something outside of the natural order to be believed in, he is obviously going to provide enough evidence, like Lazarus walking out of his tomb in front of a large crowd of bystanders. And in this respect the most convincing evidence is of a material and physical sort, such as can in no way be the product of any human mind (however pious), like the fireworks of the sun in Fatima in October, 1917. Then what is the material and physical evidence of a eucharistic miracle having taken place in any Novus Ordo Mass?

One such miracle is alleged to have taken place in the parish church of Sokulka, Eastern Poland. On October 12, 2008, a priest, ordained five years ago by a Polish bishop consecrated in 1980, dropped a Sacred Host on the altar step while distributing Holy Communion. He stopped to pick it up and placed it in the small vessel containing water next to the Tabernacle. After Mass it was locked inside the sacristy safe for the Host to dissolve in the water, so that the Real Presence would no longer be there and the water could be safely discarded. This procedure is altogether normal for such accidents in the Catholic liturgy.

But when on October 19 a parish Sister went to check on the dissolving Host, she saw in its centre some matter intensely red in colour, like a blood clot. She immediately informed the parish priest who came with other priests to observe what looked like a piece of living flesh. All observers were amazed. Next came the local Archbishop, of Bialystok, with several diocesan officials. All of them were deeply moved. By the Archbishop's instructions, on October 30 the Host was removed from the water, transferred onto a small corporal and placed in the Tabernacle to dry out. To this day it retains the form of a blood clot.

On January 7, 2009, a sample from the Host was taken to be examined by two pathomorphologists, separately, at the nearby Medical University of Bialystok. Their unanimous judgment, but independent of one another, was that “of all the tissues of living organisms, the sample most resembles human myocardial tissue,” from the left ventricle of the heart, typical for a living person in a state of agony. Furthermore both pathologists found, presumably under their microscopes, that the fibres of the myocardial tissue and the structure of the bread were so tightly bonded together that any possibility of a human fabrication was ruled out. On January 29 this material and physical evidence was presented to the Metropolitan Curia in Bialystok, where the Church’s official judgment upon the supernatural origin of the occurrence is patiently awaited. In that wait, said the Archbishop in a sermon of October, 2009, decisive will be the spiritual fruits among Catholics. Already there has been a significant rise in the piety and religious practice of local Catholics, and from abroad there have been hundreds of pilgrimages, with numerous miracles of healing and conversion also taking place.

If the material evidence is to be believed, then in Sokulka God worked one more in a long series down the ages of eucharistic miracles to help souls to believe in something normally difficult enough to believe in, namely that he is Really Present beneath the appearances, once consecrated, of bread and wine. But how is that possible when Traditional Catholics know that the New Mass is the single major cause of the Church’s destruction by loss of faith since Vatican II? An answer may be that the Sacred Heart, knowing that the shepherds were mainly responsible for the ambiguous NOM, refused to abandon his sheep, and continues to feed them with what is still Catholic amidst the ambiguity. And amidst all the Newchurch’s relative carelessness in dealing with the Holy Eucharist, the Sokulka event is also a daunting reminder to shepherds and sheep alike – “Remember whom you are handling – it is I, your God!”

Kyrie eleison.

# TRUMP'S ELECTION

No. CDXCI (491)

*December 10, 2016*

For Trump we must pray. Since last month's election  
He will be needing Heaven's own protection.

The essential thing to say about the election last month of Donald Trump as the next President of the United States is that it is a God-given reprieve from years and years of liberal government, but unless the American people themselves turn back seriously to Almighty God, then the reprieve will be swept away by a return of the liberals in force to destroy the United States once and for all, as Hilary Clinton would have done, had she been elected.

Now it is true that not many people today think of politics in terms of Almighty God, but that is exactly the problem. To shut him out of life, especially out of politics, has been a crusade for Freemasons and liberals ever since the end of their 18th century. Liberty from God has been the crusade of their substitute religion, secular humanism. Similarly in the 20th century Communism with or without the name has triumphed against nature all over the world because it acts like a religion, being, as Pius XI calls it, the messianism of materialism. And liberalism and Communism are why the entire Western world has been tilting to the left for hundreds of years.

And that is no doubt why a large number of voters in that American election voted for the candidate who lost. She was known all over the nation for her lying, immorality and treason. Her criminal record was notorious, including the suspicion of her having been responsible with her husband for the murder of well over fifty men and women who had got in the way of their ambition and careers. How could anybody halfway decent have even thought of voting for her, let alone more than half of all Americans who voted (she did not win the Electoral College)? Paul Craig Roberts himself, excellent commentator on the American political scene, is baffled by that question. The missing answer is surely that that woman incarnated the war against God. For liberals, liberty is their religion. That she proudly broke all of God's commandments was an argument not against her, but for her. She is a Saint of liberalism.

Now her conqueror, Donald Trump, is not, to all appearances, a specially godly man,

and he is still liberal in various ways – who is not? – but he has within him a good dose of that old-fashioned decency and generosity which used to be typical of the best in America and Americans. Therefore he is instinctively against ungodly people, and after years and years of self-righteous liberals under a series of liberal Presidents trampling all over decent Americans, he had had enough, and he stepped into politics “to give back to this country some of what it has given to me.” And after the same years and years of what had in fact been a one-party System, because there had not been since Governor Wallace’s time “a dime’s worth of difference between the Republicans and the Democrats,” Trump bucked the System, gave voice to the people’s frustration, and a host of decent souls voted him into office. But the System is furious.

Therefore he must now think hard. He has become President-elect on the strength of decent instincts against liberal ideology. But that is a flash in the pan, because to fight against ideology with instincts is like fighting tanks with a pea-shooter. To fight a false ideology one needs a true ideology, and to fight against war on God one needs peace with God, which will be on God’s terms and not on man’s. Now God is all-powerful and infinitely good, and he can undo the worst that his enemies can attempt to do against him with the merest flick of his little finger, so to speak. But he is not going to grant victory over the Synagogue of Satan if he knows that the people that he is saving are going to go straight back to Satan. The people must come away from Satan and turn back sincerely to God, who is not deceived.

At the very least Donald Trump himself must pray – ACTS – with Adoration, Contrition, Thanksgiving and Supplication. God has been with him, to grant this reprieve. Let us all include him and President Putin in our own prayers, to prolong the reprieve. Otherwise it could soon be over.

Kyrie eleison.

# DISTINGUISH, DISCRIMINATE

No. CDXCII (492)

December 17, 2016

When all is truth, I cannot pick and choose,  
But lies mixed in with truth I must refuse.

If the evidence, apparently serious, for Eucharistic miracles taking place within the Novus Ordo Mass (NOM) is to be believed – and such miracles may even be happening frequently, one of the latest seeming to come from Legnica, also in Poland (see [here](#)) on Christmas Day of 2013 – then indeed some of us may need to do some rethinking. Here is how one reader put it: “God cannot contradict himself, so his miracles cannot contradict his Church’s teaching. But the NOM does depart from essential Catholic doctrine on the Mass. Therefore either the miracles are false or the NOM is from God, in which case what is the justification for Traditionalists clinging to Tradition? For if the NOM at the heart of the Newchurch is confirmed by miracles, then the Newchurch is also confirmed by God, and the Newpopes, and I have to obey them. I cannot pick and choose, can I?” Yes, you can, and not only you can, but you must, in order to fulfil your absolute duty to keep the Faith.

That is because another name for what you call “picking and choosing” is “distinguishing.” All of us need to distinguish all day long. That is common sense, and that is what St Thomas Aquinas does from beginning to end of his miraculous *Summa Theologiae*. Let us take a closer look at our friend’s argument.

The basic bone of contention is the NOM. The NOM is a rite of Mass, a book of hundreds if not a thousand pages, containing many things. From a Catholic standpoint the rite as a whole is unquestionably bad, because it radically changes the concept of the Mass from being a propitiatory sacrifice centred on God to being a community meal centred on man. As such, since most Catholics live their religion by attending Mass, then when its concept changes, their religion in effect changes. That is why the NOM is the principal destroyer of the true Church, and the main engine of the Newchurch. That is why the NOM as a whole is not only bad, but very bad indeed.

But that does not mean that all its parts, as parts, are bad. As parts, some are still

Catholic because they had to be, in order to deceive the mass of priests when the NOM was introduced in 1969, that it was not essentially different from the Tridentine rite of Mass, especially in the Consecration. Otherwise they would have refused it, and it could not have done its work of destroying the Church. So the NOM is, as to its parts, part good and part bad, while as a whole, it is ambiguous, treacherous, a crooked piece of work.

However, as for men, “to the pure all things are pure” ( Titus I, 15), and so to innocent souls not yet aware of its intrinsic danger for the Faith, it can by its Consecration and good parts, still give grace and spiritual nourishment, especially when these are less strangled by a priest making the ambiguities as Catholic as possible. And as for God, he “writes straight with crooked lines,” says the proverb, and so the bad parts of the NOM need not stop him from working miracles with the Catholic parts to nourish the innocent and to warn the guilty.

Therefore on the one hand the NOM as a whole is very bad, and Traditionalists are absolutely necessary to the Church to witness to its badness, and to make available a true Mass for when souls wake up to the NOM’s badness, as they do at different times and different speeds, so that such souls can keep the Faith and last out the crisis. On the other hand the NOM is in parts still good enough to nourish innocent souls and to enable God to work miracles, also for souls’ nourishment or for their warning. God is not thereby confirming either the NOM as a whole, or the Newchurch as a whole, or the Newpopes as a whole, but he is relying on me to use my brain and the Faith which he gave me to discern good from bad. He wants no mindless robots in his glorious Heaven!

Kyrie eleison.

# ISAIAH'S CARD

No. CDXCIII (493)

*December 24, 2016*

To Jesus Christ all men on earth must turn,  
Or else, here or hereafter, they must burn.

If Almighty God were himself to send Christmas cards, what might he write in his about the coming of his own Son to be born on earth as a human child of his human Mother? In fact God wrote many things about the Messiah through the writers whom he directly inspired to put together the books of the Old Testament, and of course one of the best-known of these quotes comes from the prophet Isaiah, Chapter IX. In the preceding Chapter Isaiah has been prophesying the desolation and ruin that will come upon the Jews for their sins. In IX he turns to the glory of the Messianic age: a great light will light up Galilee – v. 1,2. (Jesus' home province). Then joy as at harvest-time or after a military victory will come(v.3), after the defeat of the Assyrians, as after Gideon's defeat of the Madianites (v.4), and the features of war will disappear (v.5). Isaiah continues with the "Christmas card" (glorified in the music of Handel's *Messiah*):

6: For a CHILD IS BORN to us, and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace. 7: His empire shall be multiplied, and there shall be no end of peace: he shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom; to establish it and strengthen it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever: the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.

6: Thus the supreme reason for joy is the coming of the Messiah: to us, to redeem all of us will be born a royal child and son, who will take the weight of the world upon his shoulder (the Church Fathers take this weight to be the Cross), and with a series of epithets Isaiah tells who the child will be: Wonderful, Counsellor, more than able to counsel all nations for their true happiness and prosperity down to the end of the world. God the Mighty – Talmudic Scripture scholars do their best to avoid admitting that Isaiah is saying that the Messiah will also be God (as Catholics know, Second Person of the Holy Trinity), but the definite article in the Hebrew and the meaning of



the expression “God the Mighty” everywhere else in the Old Testament strongly indicate that Isaiah means exactly that. The Father of the world to come – the Messiah will be a true and tender Father for the messianic age, for ever and ever (cf. Mt. XI, 28).

7: His empire shall be multiplied – the Catholic Church will spread all over the world and there shall be no end of peace because the Messiah’s Church will generate peace wherever it is respected, until world’s end. He will be a royal descendant of David to sit upon the throne of David to which it was promised that it would last for ever (II Sam. VII), as Our Lord promised to his Church (Mt. XVI, 18; XXVIII, 20). But this kingdom will be a kingdom of the King of Hearts (Jn. XII, 32), strengthened with judgment and with justice, not a kingdom of the Knave of Clubs, established by force (Mt. XXVI, 52; Jn. XVIII, 36). All these marvels will come from the zeal of the Lord God, from his burning desire to bring souls to Heaven to share eternal and uninterrupted bliss with him, for ever and ever.

What makes it difficult for us today to appreciate Isaiah’s glorious vision of the messianic future is that it has turned into the masonic past. The fifth age of the Messiah’s Church, the Age of Apostasy, began 500 years ago when Luther broke up Christendom, so that when another 200 years later it was still not yet obvious for many men that the benefits of Christendom were well on the way to being undermined, Judeo-masons could begin to persuade men that Christendom, or Christ, was no longer necessary. And not even the horrors of another 200 years later of anti-Christian Communism, let loose by the Russian Revolution and spreading worldwide, could persuade men that from the Incarnation onwards, the alternatives for any civilisation are Jesus Christ and his Catholic Church, or the Devil. But it is true.

Happy Christmas, readers!

Kyrie eleison.

# FIFTEEN COUNTRIES

No. CDXCIV (494)

December 31, 2016

The “Resistance”? Just a scattering of seeds,  
But from such started out the mightiest deeds.

The last day of the year may be a good time to take a survey of the battle for the Catholic Faith in 15 different countries visited in the course of calendar year 2016 by the author of these “Comments.” It is a battle being fought in very difficult conditions, because of course the Catholic Church depends like any organisation on its head, and Pope Francis has been giving all year long the impression of wanting to destroy the Church as it has been for 2,000 years, and to replace it with anything that will please the modern crowds, which means the media, which means the enemies of God. Truly “the Shepherd is struck and the sheep are scattered,” which includes the Society of St Pius X, but let us tell rather how all over the world God is raising up children of Abraham from stones (Mt.III, 9), who if they were to keep quiet, the very stones would have to cry out (Lk. XIX, 40).

In India, a former Society priest and Society seminarian, now a priest, are maintaining the only priory and parish of the Resistance as such on the whole sub-continent. May God be with them. In Brazil, it does seem that the episcopal consecration of Bishop Thomas Aquinas has strengthened the defence of the Faith around his Monastery. Thanks be to God. Mexico has always been strong in the Faith, and it is now the base of the excellent website in Spanish, *Non Possumus*. In Switzerland a small group of layfolk is happy in the shadow of Écône to learn some of the things that can no longer be so firmly taught in the Seminary itself, as when Archbishop Lefebvre gave so much to so many of us. In the United States where the Society had succeeded in replanting the Church’s anti-liberal doctrine all over the continent, liberalism is regaining lost ground, thanks to the Society’s disastrous change of direction since the Archbishop died. However, the US priests have not yet said their last word, and Fr Zendejas, who was one of them, is bravely rebuilding in their midst.

Two more former Society priests, Fr Chazal and Fr Picot, range all over the Far East and down to Australia and New Zealand. In Korea, a Resistance chapel is maintained

in the capital, Seoul, by a courageous medical doctor. In Japan Catholics have been decimated by World War II, Vatican II and now the slide of the Society, but there remain a few Resistance contacts, including one veteran Japanese priest. On the other hand in Asia's most Catholic country, the Philippines, Fr Chazal has dozens of Mass centres and a seminary which it will become easier to serve with the recent priestly ordination of Fr John, a native Philippino.

Back in Europe, Ireland has a new Resistance priory near Cork in the South, and Poland has a group of Catholics waking up to the Society's dangerous slide towards Rome, but they have for the moment only one aged Polish priest. Patience. In the Czech Republic there is a parallel group of ardent Catholics, looking towards priestly conversions to Tradition from the mainstream Church. Their faith is strong. In Belgium there is also a strong group in one provincial city, going back to one good priest who many years ago left behind him a legacy of Catholic conviction and piety. In Germany the Resistance is proving slow to take shape because of Germans' instinctive obedience to authority, but there are stirrings. In Italy also the Resistance is slow off the mark, because the conservatism of Catholics made the Conciliar Revolution tame compared with how it raged in some countries, but Pope Francis may change all that!

And last but not least there is France, which is always a leader in the Church, for good or ill (e.g. either Archbishop Lefebvre, or Teilhard de Chardin). French priests have always predominated within the Society, and they are now predominating in the Resistance, and hundreds of French laity come to regular conferences on the classic anti-liberal Encyclicals of pre-Conciliar Popes. But France as a country is for the moment disintegrating, because the Catholics have no true Pope to unite them, and the citizens want no Catholic King to rally them to the cause of God. However, let us have patience, because God will raise up France again, and he will lift us all up with it.

Kyrie eleison.

### *Eleison Comments*

Published by The St. Marcel Initiative

9051 Watson Road Suite 279 | St. Louis, MO 63126 USA | (855) 289-9226 | [info@stmarcelinitiative.com](mailto:info@stmarcelinitiative.com)